

JPRS-UPA-88-027
25 JULY 1968



FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

NOTICE

Effective immediately, the JPRS report SOVIET UNION/THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD, a translation of the Russian-language bimonthly journal RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR published in Moscow by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers' Movement, will no longer be published. Selected translations from this journal will be published in the following JPRS reports: SOVIET UNION/INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, SOVIET UNION/POLITICAL AFFAIRS, and SOVIET UNION/ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, according to the subject matter of the articles.

If any subscription changes are desired, subscribers should notify their distribution contact point. Nongovernment subscribers may contact the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield VA 22161.

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-027

CONTENTS

25 JULY 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Estonian 'Popular Front' Publicized in Daily	1
Founding Member Describes Program [E. Savisaar; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 7 Jun 88]	1
Connection Made to East European Movements	
[T. Vladimirova, A. Podvezko; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 7 Jun 88]	2
Estonian 'Popular Front' Member Defends Party Role in Movement	
[M. Kadastik; SIRP JA VASAR, 6 May 88]	4
Estonian 'Popular Front' Reports Activities [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 11 Jun 88]	5
ESSR's Saul Talks with Scientists About Reform Proposals	
[R. Kaarepepe; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 5 May 88]	5
Expulsion of Sumgait, NKAO Leaders from CPSU for Malfeasance Justified	
[Z. Kadymbekov; PRAVDA, 3 Jun 88]	8
New Armenian Minister of Internal Affairs Announced [KOMMUNIST, 26 Jun 88]	9
Georgian CC Sets Media Guidelines Based on 'Andreyeva Letter' Incident	
[GRUZINFORM; ZARYA VOSTOKA, 16 Apr 88]	9

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Soviet, Polish Journalists Review Glasnost Issues in Media	
[S. Stefanski, J. Rakowski; ZHURNALIST, No 4, Apr 88]	11
Uzbek CP Plans Changes in Publication of Official Reports [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 4 Jun 88]	14

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Greater Access, Better Care of State Archives Demanded [V. Molchanov; PRAVDA, 1 Jun 88]	15
Georgian Party Historian on 'Truth'; Lists Purge Victims	16

CULTURE

ZNAMYA Chief Editor Takes on Recent Defenders of Stalinism	
[Ye. Grandova; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 26 May 88]	18
Artists Warn of Enduring Stalinist 'Pseudorealism'	
[A. Chegodayev et al; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 14 Jun 88]	24
Writer Accuses Soviet Journals of 'Political Striptease' [V. Petrov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 1 Apr 88]	26
Introduction to Orwell's '1984' Given by Zalygin, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA	
[S.P. Zalygin; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 11 May 88]	28
Decline in Use of Ukrainian Language Examined	
[S. Yermolenko; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 16 Mar 88]	30
BSSR CP CC Notes Measures To Intensify Language Study in Republic Schools	
[Unattributed; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 24 Mar 88]	33

SOCIAL ISSUES

Estonian 'Greens' Movement Activist Speaks Out	
[A. Payumyae; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 13 May 88]	35
Estonian Inter-Ethnic Tensions, Press Behavior Criticism Addressed	
[V. Ivanov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 19 May 88]	36
MVD Official Recommends Greater Use of Electronic Warning Systems	
[A. Chernenko; PRAVDA, 1 Jun 88]	40

REGIONAL ISSUES

8 Jun Comments of Theater Square Protesters in Yerevan [A. Bagdasaryan, S. Nuridzhyan; KOMMUNIST, 9 Jun 88]	43
Yerevan Protesters Praise First Secretary Arutyunyan for 13 Jun Theater Square Talk [A. Muradov, G. Rubinyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 16 Jun 88]	44
Armenian Supreme Soviet Deputies on NKAO Crisis [KOMSOMOLETS, 17 Jun 88]	45
Regular Operations of Armenian Refugee Commission Detailed [S. Dzhanyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 9 Jun 88]	48
Chairman on New Council's Intent to Address Armenian Historical, Nationalities Issues [Kh. Barsegyan; KOMMUNIST, 15 Jun 88]	49
NKAO Shushinskiy Rayon Armenians Appeal to Conationals for End to Demands, Strikes [A. Mirzoyan, A. Grigoryan; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 17 Jun 88]	53
Lack of Legal Foundation for NKAO Transfer Demand Detailed [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 17 Jun 88]	53
Russian Writer Attacked for Exposing Georgians' 'Dirty Linen'	55

Estonian 'Popular Front' Publicized in Daily

Founding Member Describes Program

18000428 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by E. Savisaar (according to publication in the newspaper SIRP YA VAZAR): "The Popular Front—Revolution From Below"]

[Text] After the idea of the establishment of the Popular Front was heard from the television screen and over the radio, the groups that organized its establishment in Tallinn and Tartu received a lot of letters. People wrote about the need awakening in them to participate personally in political life, to influence the processes occurring in society, and to promote restructuring processes more actively.

Those that saw in the idea of the Popular Front a real revolutionary spirit born from below, coming from the depth of the masses, and shattering the braking mechanism that supported it. Supporters of this movement realize that restructuring gives all of us a real opportunity to get out of the crisis and to begin a worthy life. However, they also see that the opportunities offered to us today by the general party policy are utilized in localities half-heartedly and often with an obvious reluctance on the part of authorities. From these letters it is obvious that in 1985-1986 we learned to think boldly and in 1987, to talk boldly, but in 1988 it is time to gain experience to act boldly. Therefore, with the help of the Popular Front its supporters hope to promote positive shifts in industry, agriculture, ideology, and party-mindedness.

"In my opinion, three-fourths of the party members do nothing that would noticeably distinguish them for the better from nonparty members and really make them have a respectful attitude not only toward Mikhail Gorbachev personally, but also toward the party, which is at your side," a kolkhoz member from Vigala writes. "Many managers, including party members, still think that one has only to pacify another dozen 'instigators' and the people will also calm down. Then all the armchairs will remain with them—chiefs who have long gone bankrupt and have shown their inability to manage affairs."

We will agree that today such a viewpoint of the people is an illusion. Of course, it is simpler to engage in cosmetic repairs and problems of a diversionary nature. However, time is irreversible and one must be held responsible not only for what was done, but also for what was not.

Independence Lies in Unification.

The idea of the centralist doctrine that the strongest power is power gathered into one fist has prevailed in our country since Stalin's times. This is the force of

unanimity and like-mindedness, that is, one voice speaking for all and one thought for all. With such an approach any diversity of views and multiplicity of opinions are perceived as a breakup of forces. However, it is time to give up the logic engendered by the command economy. Reality itself and the real results of our long-term activity compel us to do this. The party in the person of its progressive figures and better minds demands from all of us a policy of democratization of life and active participation by all and everyone. Democracy with "screws" is impossible. Democracy requires personalities. But personalities can be formed, educated, and gain experience in public and political work only within the framework of public democratic institutions. Not for nothing do people say: One head is good, but two are better. A problem solved by one group of people can and will be solved. However, if several collectives solve it simultaneously, willingly, and with interest, the solution will be more effective and full. Of course, the solution of any problem in a democratic way, like the establishment of a democratic movement or process, will require more time, but the result will also become more substantial and the process will become irreversible, self-regulating, and capable of learning from its own mistakes.

The Popular Front movement can also be born in a democratic way, exclusively on initiative from below, and by means of self-organization.

Independent Organizing Group.

The characteristic of the Popular Front movement lies in the fact that it does not have individual, personal membership. It unifies groups of persons holding similar views. Therefore, a person considering it necessary for himself to support some concrete action by the Popular Front is not at all obligated to participate in the implementation of another action. Therefore, formalism, membership tickets, recording the number of those "involved in the movement," and mandatory regular meetings are ruled out here. Here an act of man's free will, that is, his "I want to help," "I want to do," and his independent decision, are most important of all.

Organizing groups can arise in one labor collective, or unite people at different enterprises and institutions. They can also arise in places of residence, interest clubs, and dormitories... Apparently, groups arising irrespective of official institutions will be more independent. On the other hand, a group of one labor collective seems more solid, because people know each other better and are united by daily and long-term common interests. In any case, however, impatience—the chief thing is to put together at any price a group and the largest one at that—will hinder this cause.

Local and Common Interests.

I am acquainted with one of the supporters of the Popular Front, who has a great deal of initiative. Having put together his group in western Estonia, he almost

brought it to Tallinn "to introduce order in the capital." To always motion to the "center" is a deft and, above all, convenient decision. Nevertheless, I assume that organizing groups are established primarily for activity in localities and for the protection of real local interests. The ability to see its own specific problem is a sign of maturity on the part of an organizing group, because its contact with people is manifested most distinctively in this. To protect local interests in close cooperation with deputies and through their mediation is extremely important not only in one's rayon and city, but also at the general republic and all-Union level. One should turn to Tallinn when one gets a precise idea that the roots of a local problem exceed the limits of a settlement, a rayon, or a city, when it is clear that for a long time from a local problem it has developed into a common one.

For a long time we have neglected local interests and have not noticed details behind global ones, so that the field of activity is now vast. After all, this involves environmental protection, the state of available housing (including its distribution), an optimal utilization of the republic's economic potential, and local production of consumer goods.

The Popular Front support group arises on citizens' initiative and, naturally, raises problems, which interest precisely these people. It is important not only to indicate the problem loudly, but also to strive for its solution, perhaps, with the help of jurists, within the framework of the constitution and state law, with the formation of public opinion in localities, and with the attainment of a higher level through soviets and their deputies.

Guarantees Against Bureaucratization.

The decisions of the Popular Front can be only in the nature of recommendations. The authority of public opinion and respect for the opinion of people united by this movement should promote their effectiveness. Here there are and will be no privileged posts attractive to officials. One of the guarantees of democratic administration lies in the fact that leading functions in the Popular Front movement both in the center and in localities cannot be entrusted to people occupying responsible posts in the state, party, Komsomol, or trade-union apparatus. Of course, if they wish, they can participate in the movement, enriching it with their experience. However, it is unreasonable to concentrate power in one hand for a number of understandable reasons, including the following, over which people often ponder: Usually, a senior official working to a full measure, has no time or strength left for serious participation in public work. If, however, through its functionaries coming out of the ranks of officials (even in the most positive sense of this word) the Popular Front merges with the state apparatus, which operates according to its own rules, the movement will lose the capacity for self-organization and will turn into an appendage of this apparatus. We must not borrow such examples from the past.

To Find a Human Being in Oneself.

The Popular Front movement cannot and should not limit itself to political activity. Disinterested concern for the common cause and help in specific situations should become customary and natural in the practice of support groups. A sense of duty and responsibility not only for oneself, but also for a fellow human being, should be revived here. After all, there are so many weak people among us—children, old men, and invalids—who are unable to stand up for themselves. Strong and knowledgeable people, who know how to act, must protect them. Joining the Popular Front, a person voluntarily and consciously devotes himself to serving the common cause and links to some extent his fate with the fates of others. He does this voluntarily and to the degree that he can. In the struggle for democracy and economic independence a sense of being the master, a sense of self-worth, is developed in man. In the common cause, resolving it independently and testing it this way and that, people learn to respect the opinion of each other, to respect the person, not the position, and creative thinking, not a blind execution of directives. The feeling of being a "screw" in the incomprehensible state machine disappears in man. In brief, the possibility for an extensive moral improvement in our society, where every person will be able to find a human being in himself, is seen in the Popular Front.

We Are United by the Policy of Renewal.

Supporters of the Popular Front are united by the desire to make restructuring irreversible. Every nation living in Estonia can enrich our movement with its originality and uniqueness. Every person involved in the political life of the Estonian SSR and connected in his life with this land, no matter what he is in nationality, that is, Russian, Polish, Jewish, Belorussian, Ukrainian, and so forth, will find his way to the Popular Front. We do not distribute the place of location of nations on the planet and do not choose neighbors for ourselves. We simply have to live in a neighborly way, avoiding unnecessary tension and resolving common causes together. On the other hand, together we elect those that guide us and solve problems on a state scale. Therefore, elections to all organs together represent one of the main spheres of activity by the Popular Front. The Popular Front cannot replace a single organ of power and under no circumstances should strive for this. On the other hand, it is capable of expressing the will of the people through these organs.

Connection Made to East European Movements
18000428 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 7 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by T. Vladimirova and A. Podvezko: "What Should the Movement Be Like?"]

[Text] "To utilize all the forms of direct democracy and direct participation of popular masses in the development, adoption, and fulfillment of state and other decisions."

(Political report to the 27th CPSU Congress)

It is Friday, 3 June, the Estonproyekt hall, 1500 hours. A city meeting of representatives of support groups for the Popular Front. There are two of us. We register our group on a special form, receive a badge, and enter the hall. We have neither programs, nor plans, but we want to participate in restructuring personally. The representation here, at the meeting, is most diverse. There are groups like ours and there are also groups with more than 100 people. We go to the hall. The amphitheater and balcony are filled to capacity.

First, historical deviation. The Popular Front is a form of unification of popular masses, which emerged in a number of countries on the eve of World War II in the process of struggle against Hitlerism for safeguarding workers' vital interests, national independence, democracy, and social progress. The idea of the Popular Front was first implemented in France in 1935.

Second, contemporary deviation. The Popular Front in a number of countries of the socialist camp (except for Cuba, the USSR, and Mongolia) unites democratic and political parties, trade unions, and women's, youth, cooperative, and other mass organizations in support of democratic transformations. The composition and content of activity of the Popular Front and its forms change depending on conditions. The experience of the Popular Front was reflected in documents of international conferences of communist and workers' parties (1957, 1960, and 1969).

A. E. Sillari, first secretary of the Tallinn Gorkom, welcomes those gathered in the Estonproyekt hall. He wishes them success in work and in realizing the ideas of the meeting, which was conceived as a brainstorm: "What should the Popular Front be like and what should it do?"

Third deviation. The Popular Front prepares and holds elections, ensures a fair representation of various public organizations and social strata in state organs, and deals with problems of public services and amenities and so forth. For example, in Hungary it engages in the study of public opinion and collection of proposals on how to accelerate the economic development of society and to improve people's well-being.

E. Kornell, deputy head of the Legal Department of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, member of the organizing group of the Popular Front, appears at the rostrum. From the viewpoint of the Basic Law of the state he gives an evaluation of the present stage in the process of formation of the Popular Front. It does not yet exist legally. It is not clear whether it should be a single

organization, or a union of various groups and associations with the widest palette of interests, but united by a single strategic task.

E. Savisaar, member of the organizing group, makes a survey of the state of the movement in support of the Popular Front. To date more than 400 support groups have been established in Tallinn alone. Their number is growing day after day. At the same time, the problem of national relations is also on the agenda. Whereas 5 years ago the majority of Estonians recognized that there were problems in this area, but the Russian-language part of the population did not feel them, today both note that this problem is significant.

In order that the Popular Front might not turn into a national front, there should be no alienation among various population groups. Attention should not be focused on different interests, but concentrated on common, vitally important ones. Here it is necessary to avoid extremes and imprudent statements and to strive for being well informed and for glasnost. Otherwise, precedents arise, such as the letter from Dombrovskiy's group from Pyarnu, calling itself "the center for the protection of international unity and brotherhood of all USSR nations," which was published in the newspaper PYARNU KOMMUNIST.

Having weighed and examined all the proposals received from support groups, what strategic goals does the organizing group of the Popular Front propose on its part?

To carry out "the five-year plan" action aimed at checking the fulfillment of plans for housing construction and their correction for next year. To exercise control over the development and adoption of plans in other sectors of the republic's national economy. To take part in the preparation for forthcoming elections of people's deputies with a view to ensuring maximum democracy and consideration of citizens' urgent interests. These are long-term tasks. For the near future E. Savisaar proposed that preparations be made for a meeting with delegates to the 19th party conference.

The work of the meeting continued in rayon sections, where proposals by the organizing group of the Popular Front were discussed and elections to rayon soviets of representatives of the Popular Front were held.

When the work of sections was completed, a joint declaration by participants in the meeting was adopted. A representative of Dvigatel and V. Rudenya, chairman of the plant's labor collective council, spoke before them.

Estonian 'Popular Front' Member Defends Party Role in Movement

18150033 Tallinn SIRP JA VASAR in Estonian
6 May 88 p 2

[Text]

Weekly Letter

Time To Go To The Front

"Not him again!" may well express the perplexity of those reading the cultural paper. He just had his say in this column not too long ago.

True enough! This is my second time going to bed with the same paper, this time in connection with some events (Journalism Day, the 40th anniversary of "Edasi"). Life is changing so fast, however, that the actual celebration message was obsolete even before I started penning the first lines. And that's why I'm taking on what may well be the hottest issue of the moment: the Popular Front. There should be an exclamation mark here, but I do believe that PF does not need any more ovations, but rather sober deliberation and—if need be—even a question mark. In any case, the initiative group, whose Tartu chapter includes this writer, is waiting for a critical discussion of its submitted proposals. PF will not profit from easily spreading euphoria, nor from running amock (from the "Lexicon of Foreign Words": sudden attack of madness, mainly in the islands of Malaysia; where the enraged person storms to the street with a knife and attempts to kill anyone in his way). Nor would our society be improved in any way by a prohibitive zone of criticism around the PF. Nevertheless such zones still tend to surround the causes and the people formerly subject to official disfavor.

A few concrete examples.

In "Edasi" of 26 April, a Tartu family complained about the memorial ceremony for the 192 murder victims held in connection with the historical preservation days (the trampling of the crowds gathered at the Rapka-Tamme cemetery caused damage to the surrounding graves). Immediately, the editorial offices received letters and speeches defending historical preservation: But what did the Soviet power itself do at the same cemetery in 1944? Yes, under the shield of the Soviet power crimes were committed at that time when, among others, one corner of the Rapka-Tamme cemetery was turned upside-down to hide the traces of the awful deeds of 1941. Still, none of this can be used to justify all the blunders of today.

Another example. Vello Pohla, in "Edasi" of 27 April, dared to question the moral integrity of the Creative Unions' Cultural Council, as long as no clear stand has been taken on the behavior of national delegates representing the creative unions during the last session of the supreme council. When the newspaper presented demands to the worker-delegates, no one doubted the

need of the principle; while the opposing delegates of the creative unions responded by consigning part of the readers to a look, but "no touch" status. One who turned to the editors (but not on the side of creative unions) accused V. Pohla in an attempt to "split the national unity." I am convinced that neither the historical preservation nor the creative unions need that kind of support—they are sufficiently strong to answer on their own behalf. Above all, we should calmly determine if, indeed, and where we have erred. No shaky defense efforts, nor accusations delivered by the prosecution can bring us closer to truth and unity.

Obviously, the problem of unity is also becoming a complicated one throughout the formation of the Popular Front. Here you have people of diverse interests and life experience coming together, all of them wanting to support the course of innovation. Yet, there are many ways to support perestroika. Do we have enough tolerance for each other? (I have noticed that some, who excitedly stand up against totalitarianism, are those who are the least tolerant of any thought differing from their own understanding). The Popular Front is known to be an open political movement, but politics tends to favor diplomacy, yes, even compromise.

Again, browsing through the lexicon: diplomacy is the defense of one's interests and rights in a peaceful manner, skillful and deliberate action. Apparently, this is where the mistrust comes in: where does skillful politics end, and cheap conjuncturing begin?

The questions are many. According to one opinion expressed, the Popular Front is put in its place: "It deals with another attempt by communists to seize the initiative. Lauristin wants to become president, Savisaar prime minister, Palm to be first secretary of the party." What is one to make of it? Those who wouldn't want to cooperate with members of the CPSU because they are members of the USSR, obviously wouldn't support Gorbachev's course of innovation, and therefore could not join the PF. Anyone with the slightest grasp on reality will realize that the bulk of Estonian brainpower comes from the heads of party members—only together can we accomplish anything. The party should come to the same realization—as meanwhile, with its own wisdom, the society itself has been brought to the brink of disaster. Generally, we are afraid that the PF will come to be unduly influenced by the party leadership, but avoiding contact at all costs would also preclude the possibility of exerting our PF influence on the party and its apparatus?

People should not be underestimated, yet I dare predict that due to the Popular Front, significance will be centered on its leaders, its personalities. There's nothing wrong with that. For decades, the ability of individuals to make politics has been denegated, and colorful personalities shoved to the background. Now, when there is a crying need for new leaders, we have to admit: there aren't enough individuals around who would wish, and be able to translate people's longings into a mundane language of action. Not only for the high seats of government, but also for the cities and districts. This will be the grand mission of PF: to create opportunities for the emergence of capable politicians. PF's active participation in the election campaign should result in the right

people being placed in the right positions. If, for example, citizen AA (not an allusion to Arno Almann) is elected president of the republic, he must relinquish his leadership function with the PF. In the future, the new president AA is subject to the same public control as his predecessor. Everything seems to start all over again.

My feelings are a little mixed about a publication for the PF. (I am not afraid of competition, and that much more since the role of the PF publication was offered to "Edasi" in the radio broadcast of the Cultural Council. I understand the function of an informational bulletin. But what will the PF's special publication be printing that is different from that already found in the rest of Estonian journalism? Once the PF has achieved its goal—to influence elective organs—then it would also be influencing the publications of these organs. Obviously then, the wish for creating our OWN newspaper is based on fears that the power apparatus can one day just shut off the channels of mass communications to the PF. If we believe, however, that the powers can ignore people in such a fashion, then they can also, just as easily, close down that special paper of the PF.

Perhaps my profession has spoiled my thoughts too much, but I can foresee that any kind of publication, in any concrete setting, will call for clear regulations, like whose voice should be carried, and in what proportions (because people are multi-voiced), and assume the development of a structure for PF, paid front workers, etc. I can already imagine the PF office (pardon me—Assembly of Delegates) taking up the issue of "political upbringing for those working out of the deficit of the PF publication..."

This is just the way we'll never want to see the Popular Front. Can we avoid the devils of bureaucracy, without whom we are not yet used to living. Let's hope to God we can!

Mart Radastik

08309

Estonian 'Popular Front' Reports Activities
18000504 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 11 Jun 88 p 3

[Text] A press conference for journalists was held by the initiators of the Estonian Popular Front on 9 June at the Press Club. Participants in the press conference included such well-known social activists in the republic as: E. Savisaar, M. Lauristin, L. Koyk, E. Golikov, F. Undusk and others. The journalists were informed about the status of the movement's organization in the republic. Over 800 support groups of the Popular Front have already been formed, with a total membership of about 40 thousand people. The main slogan of the Popular Front is: "All power to the soviets!"

The program of activities of the Popular Front for the near future includes: organizing meetings with delegates to the 19th Party Conference, conducting a meeting in Tartu in memory of the victims of Stalinism and the anniversary of the first stage of deportations. Items with the insignia of the Popular Front are being prepared, such as emblems, badges and a flag.

In the fall the Popular Front intends to examine how the law on national discussion of important problems in the public life in Estonia was being realized, and to discuss the draft plan of social and economic development in the republic for the 13th five-year plan.

The Popular Front appealed to the leadership of the republic to meet with the working people more often. The door behind which important decisions are made by a small group of people must be opened. Popular Front groups are called upon to work closely with local authorities.

In the near future the first issue of the bulletin of the Popular Front will be published. Its circulation will be 5.5 thousand copies (including one thousand in Russian, a proportional number to the Russian-speaking support groups of the Popular Front).

It was noted at the press conference that, unfortunately, Russian and other non-native inhabitants of Estonia until recently have been less informed than Estonians about the goals and tasks of the new movement. This situation is now being improved.

The initiators of the Popular Front answered many questions posed by the journalists.

ESSR's Saul Talks with Scientists About Reform Proposals

18000380 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 5 May 88 pp 1, 3

[Report by R. Kaarepepe: "Dialogue with Scientists"]

[Text] On 29 April Chairman of the ESSR Council of Ministers Bruno Saul met with economic scientists, sociologists, demographers, philosophers, naturalists, legal experts, and representatives of the technical sciences well-known in the republic. A frank and constructive exchange of opinions on problems of the sore points of the economic, political, and cultural development of Estonia as well as on the strategy and prospects of development of social life took place.

In a short speech the government chairman emphasized that any country requires that the representatives of science and state power be like-minded people, and in today's Estonia this question is of great importance. Restructuring and glasnost have deepened the contradictions between being and consciousness. Changes in the economy which require time and capital have lagged behind the changes in human consciousness. Also resulting from this are the sense of danger which many people in Estonia are feeling and some uncertainty and anxiety for the future of their land and people and for the destiny

of restructuring, which the joint plenum of creative unions eloquently confirmed. The creative thought of the scientists of various fields of knowledge is also needed today for precise national identification and in order to accelerate the development of social life and define the priorities and formulate the strategy of development.

Of course, scientific thought and state power did not exist apart from one another in the past either. Fresh examples of the resulting cooperation are the unified front against the ill-conceived mining of phosphate rock, the formulation of comprehensive programs of development of science and technology, and the formulation of a set of measures to improve the demographic situation. Life itself demands that such cooperation be expanded and deepened.

B. Saul proposed discussing the idea of creating a standing scientific council under the government chairman which would forecast the possibility of the emergence of dangerous situations in certain directions of socioeconomic life and promptly envision measures to overcome them. The existence of such a council would make it possible to recruit scientists for more active participation in the process of developing governmental decisions of fundamental importance.

We must act immediately!

Cyberneticist Boris Tamm began his speech with these words. It is time to correct the mistakes and distortions both in thinking and in deed. But first we must specify where the bottlenecks are and why.

There are arbitrary actions by Union departments and at times even direct deception in realizing their plans in Estonia.

The naturalist Endel Lippmaa examined this theme which disturbed everyone using numerous examples. For it was precisely departmental willfulness which was the reason why the idea of the republic's economic independence was approved by the people long before the serious scientific discussion of this idea began. The numerous design offices of the all-Union departments which are located in Estonia and serve the Union plants are also lagging behind in the scientific sense.

The economist Uno Mereste emphasized that we must consistently hold a course to expand Estonia's economic sovereignty and in the very near future obligate the Union plants to work on the republic's needs.

That presupposes following a purposeful economic policy and in formulating this policy scientists and the broad public may show great support of the government.

Medical specialist Laur Karu and demographer Arvo Kuddo spoke of the obstacles on the path of developing the social sphere. People are beginning to feel a sense of

helplessness and alienation. The person does not feel that the government is working on his problems. The person must be made the center of socioeconomic policy as soon as possible.

The philosophers Yaan Rebane and Andrus Pork focused attention on the questions of the numerous flaws in determining national and cultural processes and the poor knowledge of public opinion and the inability to direct it.

The present condition of the environment intensifies people's anxiety about the future. The naturalist Erast Parmasto singled out two tasks which must be performed immediately. They are the need for a new complete survey of the condition of the environment as well as the desirability of an all-people's discussion of the concept of nature conservation.

The legal scientists Igor Gryasin and Kheyno Siygur devoted their speeches to the possibilities of refining legislative acts and bringing them into line with objective economic laws. The scientist-jurists of Tartu State University are ready to help in preparing legislative acts.

Those present at the meeting agreed that sore points are sometimes overdramatized today. The reason for that is poor and not always precise information. The State Committee for Statistics should be bolder and must rid itself of outdated ideas of what can and cannot be discussed openly about the economy.

Efficiently, precisely, comprehensively, and convincingly informing the population about the decisions of the republic government has become a serious problem. The participants in the meeting agreed that an information group should be set up under the government.

They also talked about how the press, the radio, and television sometimes publish and broadcast false information and irresponsible and unsubstantiated statements permeated with demagoguery. That represents a serious danger to the unity of our people and may lead to a crisis in trust among various social strata. Party and soviet workers and everyone must actively seek paths of cooperation with journalists and labor collectives by deepening constructive dialogue.

In the opinion of the chairman of the Council of Ministers and the economic scientists Arno Keern, Raymond Khagelberg, Yaak Leymann, and others, the publication in Estonia of an economic journal would help revitalize economic thought and lay a bridge of trust among scientists, specialists, and the broad public.

We are poor, we are foolish.

So said Yaak Leymann. Today that, alas, is in keeping with reality.

We are poor since in the years of stagnation the Soviet Union sank lower and lower in the list of states in terms of such an indicator as the amount of national wealth per capita and now occupies a place which is by no means appropriate taking into account our potential, needs, and prestige. Moreover, today more and more countries are moving ahead more rapidly than we are and our technological backwardness continues to grow. How can we get moving? First of all by greater use of high technology in production, reconstruction of production, and a jump in technology. In the estimation of Raymond Khagelberg, today's Estonia would have to spend 7-8 billion rubles in order to reach the world standard in equipment and technology. A technological jump in many sectors of production is possible today only by relying on foreign equipment. We need foreign currency and we need it now, immediately. But in order to do this we must become wiser—in economic theory as a whole and in particular regarding international currency relations, market conditions, and banking business. We are still elementary students here, but life already requires a professorial level. Therefore we must send more students and young and enterprising specialists to study abroad both at universities and in economic organizations.

But in addition to preparing for a real breakthrough into the world market with our goods, we must also carefully analyze our present poorly-utilized potential.

Estonian science can and **must** be induced to earn foreign currency. The experience of physicists and cyberneticists must inspire the rest.

The cyberneticist Enn Tyugu pointed out the possibility of developing tourism, in such of way that it would be of benefit above all to the republic, of course.

What has been hard-earned should be used skillfully. The specialist in the field of information science Ustus Agur told in detail how to invest foreign currency in our economy.

We must be able to forecast.

Many people emphasized this idea. In order to solve today's problems, we must know precisely what we expect from tomorrow and the next day.

We must learn how to forecast future directions of development of the scientific-technical and economic mechanism and picture how people want to see our education and culture in the start of the next century.

All this requires bold and at first glance even perhaps reckless ideas, the scientist-economists Yukhan Sillaste and Pezter Kross emphasized. You cannot learn how to swim in a bathtub. That must be remembered when refining future economic practice. The commercial concern and the stockholders' corporation, joint firms with Union departments whose controlling block is in our

hands, and joint enterprises with other Union republics—all of these must be tried in order to find out exactly what path will lead to success.

Cooperation must continue.

Everyone present supported the idea of creating a scientific council under the chairman of the Council of Ministers. It should be assembled just as soon as the chairman of the Council of Ministers or the scientific council deems it necessary.

In the future consultations will also be conducted in small work groups in order to solve certain special problems. In order to solve these problems the scientific council will also recruit other scientists in that field. The creation of temporary scientific collectives to make an indepth analysis of the economy's crucial problems is possible.

In summarizing the results of the meeting, the scientists and the chairman of the Council of Ministers noted that the exchange of opinions which took place was useful and meaningful.

B. Saul singled out three main directions in further joint work: the creation of a scientifically substantiated scientific-technical and socioeconomic concept; the formation of a mutually beneficial and equivalent system of exchange in relations with Union organs and other republics; and the creation of an efficient economic and social mechanism to protect the environment, normalize the demographic situation, and continue to develop national relations and national culture.

We can reach the goals posed only in the process of fundamental updating of the economic mechanism through following an independent economic policy.

In addition it is necessary to scientifically study the question of the gradual shift of Union machine-building and instrument-building enterprises to republic subordination as well as shifting our agricultural complex, fishing industry, foreign tourism, and the like to the republic's direct subordination. The system of control must be simplified. Questions of reficing distribution relations and of the struggle for a normative mechanism of distribution continue to be paramount.

Significant changes in the state budget system are coming. There are two principles of updating. First, in formulating the budget we begin by figuring incomes so that then we ourselves can distribute costs, and, secondly, the state budget must link all production enterprises with the socioeconomic development of the given rayon. The realization of these principles presupposes serious scientific study. The government is also relying on scientists when preparing price reforms and expanding wholesale trade and in the work to guarantee all the legal rights of enterprises and cooperatives.

Expulsion of Sumgait, NKAO Leaders from CPSU for Malfeasance Justified

18300275 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 88 p 4

[Article by Zaur Kadymbekov, PRAVDA's own correspondent, Baku: "The Measure of Guilt"]

[Text] A short report about this plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee was published the day before yesterday. And already beginning in the morning the telephone rings began to be heard in PRAVDA; readers expressed the desire to find out in greater detail about it. Why, the decisions adopted deserve it.

In my memory, there has not been a case that they excluded from the ranks of the party simultaneously a candidate member of the republic Communist Party Central Committee—the obkom first secretary, and a member of the republic Central Committee—the gorkom first secretary. Two different people went up on the rostrum to answer for errors and shortcomings they had permitted. And in order to ask the plenum for leniency. They asked. Each one in his own way.

B. Kevorkov is the former first secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh Party Obkom. He is under 60 years old. Stout, sedate. Even in a situation so critical for him, he tries to behave, what is called, with dignity. He reads from a sheet with a well-delivered voice, as in former times he read smooth texts about the successes and achievements of the oblast for an almost 15-year period of his being in the high post. And only at the very end his voice wavered:

"Comrades, there is no meaning in life without the party, this punishment is too harsh for me."

Is that really so? The Party Control Committee under the republic Communist Party Central Committee scrupulously, step by step, studied the activity of Kevorkov when he was obkom first secretary. The conclusions of the examination read out at the plenum leave no doubt: Kevorkov permitted gross political errors and serious violations in the selection and placement of cadres, and he relied, as was correctly noted in the letter of a group of party veterans from Nagorno-Karabakh to the Central Committee, "on sycophants and flatterers."

From the office, which in recent years he left mainly for festive and ceremonial occasions, what was happening around was perceived in the same ceremonial way: Not daily life, full of difficulties and anxieties, but its varnished reflection. In this life, invented for himself and his immediate surroundings, there were no problems. Left outside their line of vision, the problems snowballed. The enterprises worked increasingly poorly, having frustrated the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan with respect to the growth rates for industrial production, and

things in capital construction deteriorated. This held back the development of the social sphere. Disorders of various sorts called forth the growing dissatisfaction of people. Then it also went over into the sphere of international relations. What this led to, all already know. And the participants of the plenum also knew how much still recently Kevorkov got away with with the full connivance of the republic party organs. Having guarded him against criticism, they did not thoroughly investigate the affairs of the oblast. They left them "to be farmed out" to one individual. He was unable to oppose anything to the unhealthy inclinations at the moment of the events and manifested a lack of will and complete helplessness.

... People went up to the rostrum not according to a notorious list, without papers. They spoke sincerely, from the heart. The free and democratic atmosphere—in the spirit of the time, in the spirit of perestroika—guaranteed the objectivity of the decisions. The discussion showed: The Kevorkov's guilt is enormous. You see, the events that began in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast were recalled with a heavy echo in Sumgait, where another person proved to be unequal to the task, who also answered for his actions.

D. Muslim-zade, the former first secretary of the Sumgait Gorkom. His biography is much shorter. He is hardly past 40 years of age. He was in the responsible post for a total of about 2 years. Before Sumgait, he worked as the first secretary of the republic Komsomol Central Committee. Impulsive, impetuous, and inconsistent in action. Was he right in shutting himself off from the tragic events in the city, in not feeling guilty for failing to prevent them?

Muslim-zade, incidentally, at first denied his guilt, but the whole course of the plenum, evidently, convinced even him—it is impossible to disprove the obvious: He did not return from his holiday, knowing about the events in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and he manifested political short-sightedness and unconcern.

During the intermission of the plenum, a session of the Central Committee Buro was held, at which questions of the implementation of the program for the socio-economic development of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, outlined by the party and the government, were discussed.

"We are indebted to the people of this territory," said the first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, A. Vezirov. The implementation of the program that was adopted is the chief task of the day.

New Armenian Minister of Internal Affairs Announced

18300349 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 26 Jun 88 p 2

[Edict of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: "On the Appointment of U. S. Arutyunyan as Minister of Internal Affairs of the Armenian SSR, and the Release of Comrade A. S. Shaginyan From This Post"; signed by Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman G. Voskanyan and Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary N. Stepanyan; dated 25 June 1988, in Yerevan.]

[Text] The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves:

1. To appoint comrade Usik Surenovich Arutyunyan as minister of internal affairs of the Armenian SSR.
2. To release comrade Aykaz Srapionovich Shaginyan from duties as minister of internal affairs of the Armenian SSR in connection with his retirement.

Usik Surenovich Arutyunyan was born in 1945 in the Armenian SSR city of Oktemberyan. He is an Armenian and has been a CPSU member since 1969. He graduated from the Yerevan Polytechnical Institute imeni K. Marx.

He began his employment history as a factory worker, later working as a teacher in a rural school. After graduation from the institute, he worked from 1967 to 1973 at the machinebuilding plant in Oktemberyan, where he rose from the position of engineer-technologist to become chief engineer of the enterprise.

From 1973 to 1977 Arutyunyan worked in the Komsomol organization, becoming the Komsomol's Oktemberyan Raykom 1st secretary and 2nd secretary of the Armenian Komsomol Central Committee.

Since 1979, after graduation from the Higher School of the USSR KGB, Arutyunyan has been working in Armenia's organs of state security, serving since 1985 as deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR KGB.

Comrade U. S. Arutyunyan has been awarded the Red Star, the Badge of Honor, and other medals.

UD/362

Georgian CC Sets Media Guidelines Based on 'Andreyeva Letter' Incident

18300260 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 16 Apr 88 pp 1-2

[GRUZINFORM report: "To Increase Political Responsibility for Perestroika"]

[Text] The Central Committee of the Georgian CP passed a resolution "On Organizational and Political Measures in Connection with PRAVDA's Editorial 'Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Character of Thought and Actions'".

The resolution notes that PRAVDA's editorial of 6 Apr 88 "Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Character of Thought and Actions" contains the statements and conclusions fundamental for the new stage of socialist development, which are based on the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee; and provides a timely and conclusive rebuff to the revisionist and anti-perestroika moods reflected in N. Andreyeva's publication in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. PRAVDA's editorial helps to consolidate forces around perestroika as is evident from the numerous responses received by the Party and Soviet authorities and the republican press.

Party organizations in Georgia and the mass information media carry out consistent measures directed on developing democratization and glasnost, and forming public opinion actively oriented on perestroika. At the same time, preparation for the 19th All-Union Party conference dictates the necessity of even larger deepening and widening of this work by all means of organizational, ideological Party influence.

Taking into consideration the urgency of the problems stated by PRAVDA and the necessity of their wide discussion in order to increase the political responsibility, stimulate the social activity and initiative of all communists and working people of the republic, and deep realization of the irreversibility of the democratization and glasnost process as a condition of development and qualitative renovation of Soviet society, the Central Committee of the Georgian CP tasked the Party obkoms, gorkoms, and rayons, to organize in all primary Party organizations using Party aktiv, political education system, and propaganda through lectures, at Party meetings and republican offices and enterprises, the discussion and explanation of the statements and conclusions contained in the PRAVDA's editorial, with determining the role and practical input of each person in the perestroika process based on concrete local problems. It is recognized to be effective if the members of the Central Committee, obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms, revision commissions, Party apparatus workers, and representatives of science and creative intelligentsia, would participate in the work of the meetings.

Special attention should be paid to increasing the responsibility of managerial links for the state moral and social climate, developing the self-management of the working collective, flexibly organizing economic education for all and implementing the economic reform, strengthening criticism and self-criticism, forming politically mature thinking, and not separating the principles of democratization and glasnost from practical problems and requirements of working collectives. All the Party and political work in this direction must be connected with the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party conference.

A task is put before the management of republican and local newspapers, journals, TV and radio, information agency, and publishing houses: to achieve a larger political argumentation of publications; not to allow one to

make statements disorienting the public, as took place on the pages of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA; to ensure balanced, constructive polemics and discussions, based on principle and consistent implementation of the Party course, and the correct shaping of public opinion with regard to democratization and glasnost in light of the requirements contained in the speech of comrade M.S. Gorbachev at the January (1988) meeting at the CPSU Central Committee meeting with the managers of mass information media, ideological institutions, and creative unions.

Scientific institutions and institutes of higher learning are directed to resolve issues of civic development which are urgent for the republic; depict the historic realities from the positions of today; analyze the problems of politics and ideology based on principle in the light of the new stage of socialist development; and the role of

historical and national self-consciousness, and international relations in the general process of a qualitative renovation of Soviet society.

Komsomol organizations and educational institutions must organize for the studying and working youth meetings with veterans of the Party, war, and labor, and cultural workers, and scientists, with discussions of the problems of history of the Soviet society and the urgent problems of its development, in order to actively shape the new thinking of the young generation, civic activity, and social responsibility.

The resolution also outlines a series of measures directed toward the further deepening of the politically-organizational work under the conditions of perestroyka.

13355

Soviet, Polish Journalists Review Glasnost Issues in Media

18300249 Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian
No 4, Apr 88 pp 78-81

[Roundtable discussion between Soviet and Polish journalists: "The World and The Press: We Know, But Does the Reader?..."]

[Text] A roundtable meeting, organized by the journals PRZYJAZN and ZHURNALIST, was held in Warsaw near the end of 1987. The topic of discussion was "the tasks of journalists in the declaration on Soviet-Polish cooperation in ideology, science and culture."

The roundtable participants were:

Stanislaw Stefanski, chief editor, PRZYJAZN.

Jerzy Rakowski, deputy chief editor. He has worked for a long time as Moscow correspondent for the newspaper SHTANDAR MLODYKH.

Jan Cichocki, department editor, PRZYJAZN. He was a PRZYJAZN correspondent in the USSR.

Leonid Toporkov, IZVESTIYA correspondent in the Polish People's Republic.

Viktor Gribachev, foreign press department editor, ZHURNALIST.

We are publishing material from their conversation.

[Stanislaw Stefanski] Right away, I would like to note that the Polish mass information media are devoting tremendous attention to the changes occurring in the Soviet Union and to everything related to restructuring.

However, there are some questions: are we fully utilizing our opportunities for journalistic contacts to provide in-depth coverage of the changes taking place in the Soviet Union? Are we successfully concentrating attention on the cardinal problems and singling out the essence of these changes?

[Viktor Gribachev] We have talked "about expanding and deepening mutual understanding among journalists" so much and for so long that these words have become meaningless cliches. The declaration very specifically defined a program for the joint work of journalists from both countries: "Soviet and Polish societies should be well informed about all important events in each other's country."

In this connection, I would like to recall an article by newsman Anatoliy Druzenko, "Five Years Later," published at the end of 1986. As a newspaper correspondent in Poland from 1977 to 1983, he noted at that time that "to this day, many things in Poland, especially for a newcomer, evoke questions. These are often puzzling

questions, yet even more often, they are naive." Just how much have we failed to inform the Soviet reader? How will we justify ourselves to him?

[Jerzy Rakowski] It seems to me that our readers also lack a very clear image of what is taking place in the Soviet Union. We indicate what the Soviet leadership is doing, cover basic trends in the Soviet Union's international policy and report on M.S. Gorbachev's speeches. We discuss new literature in detail. We report on things which previously went untold: an airplane crash, a train catastrophe...

Yet, what do we report about the "ground floors," about restructuring at the level of a specific enterprise or rayon? What do we report about what the people are thinking and how restructuring is affecting them: is life getting easier or more complicated; are they satisfied or dissatisfied...? There are economic questions about the reform. Again, we write about decisions at the high level, but what about at the factory? Our coverage of this is not so good.

These are our professional shortcomings, the journalists' fault. I say "fault," but I can also list—not justify—the reasons for our failures. Are there problems with trips and finances? Yes, but that is not the main point. We lack sufficient strength and talent to give the full picture. At press club meetings people always ask: "How do people live over in the Soviet Union?" "What can you get at the market, what are the prices, what is in the stores?" They ask because we, unfortunately, rarely write about this.

[Leonid Toporkov] One such eternal question, for example, is: what is Polish agriculture like? Our reader knows very little about this. I wrote a fairly long analytical article on this subject. In Poland, after all, the country's basic food producer is what we would call the private farmer. However, there is no private farmer here in the pure sense: a peasant—a hard worker, who labors from morning to night and knows no holidays. Really, what kind of individualist is he, if he is tied to the state by contractual obligations? He sells produce to the state, i.e., he provides bread, vegetables and so forth for the worker's table. The most interesting part is that he does not feel like an individualist, a private farmer, but considers himself a full-fledged member of society. It is not a matter of how much he earns, but of how much he both works and earns. The point is that he produces. It is precisely he who makes a tremendous contribution to what we refer to as the Food Program. Just today I received our newspaper, carrying the correspondence article, "Arguments Surrounding 'Agrotekhniko.'" It is about how a company was organized which, not taking a single kopek from the government, contributes millions to it and still earns well for itself. Yet we think with inertia: it is suspicious if people are getting well paid... One of the local party leaders told me: fairly does not mean equally. While people's stomachs may be the same, their heads and hands are not.

It is impossible to satisfy this interest in each other without a complete and truthful discussion of life both in Poland and in the Soviet Union. We blame journalists for silence on one thing or another. However, after all, besides the author, there are still the editors. We must also free the editorial board from old approaches: whereas we may be successful in describing "internal" restructuring, we are greatly behind in international journalism.

[Jan Cichocki] Here is the question of questions: why is tourism between our countries developing so poorly? What must be done so that a normal person can buy a ticket and visit his friends? It would be easier on us, if we started writing for people who have already seen something. Why is it that a person can visit Sweden if he has the money, but he cannot go to Kaluga to see a friend with whom he studied at the university?

[Jerzy Rakowski] I agree with you. As of 1 January 1988, individual trips by Poles to the Soviet Union have been possible. I called the director of the "Orbis" bureau (tourist bureau) and asked what was available. He answered: the bureau has two rooms in Kiev, two rooms in Moscow and two in Leningrad. "Go ahead, develop tourism..." There is very little.

[Viktor Gribachev] Our journal is running a discussion on restructuring in international journalism. It is obvious to everyone now that the most difficult part is talking about life in the socialist countries. There is nothing for us to be shy about with each other. There are problems and we should write about them—which brings up the matter of specialization in publications.

Before coming to Warsaw, Leonid Vasilyevich read your publication for the year. All the major events in Poland were covered: the second stage of the economic reform, the Roman pope's visit and the fair in Belostok. The newspaper "Financial Times" and radio "Free Europe" responded with rejoinders to the attacks against Poland and prepared materials on culture...

Today, however, while many newspapers are narrowing the topics of their articles, some are not. For instance, PRAVDA, in addition to the activity of fraternal parties, suddenly began covering the CEMA Comprehensive Program. SOVETSKAYA KULTURA held a roundtable meeting on the development of Soviet-Polish cultural relations. Do you think that, taking into account the interests of the readers whom you just mentioned, you could choose some specific topic for IZVESTIYA—naturally, having agreed with the management—and then provide brief information about the other topics? One could find out about them in more detail from other newspapers—as they say, according to type.

[Leonid Toporkov] In either event, I do have a bias of some sort which is determined by my newspaper's type. I frequently feel like writing on how work by local authorities is carried out at the city or provincial level.

However, I view your suggestion with some caution. One must not impoverish the reader; one should depict the life of a country somewhat broadly and relate all of the most important events in Poland and the other socialist countries.

[Jan Cichocki] The declaration assigns responsible tasks to us, yet it also offers tremendous opportunities. We journalists have lagged somewhat behind both the politicians and leaders who adopted this document, as well as economic managers, who have been cooperating economically for a long time. We only observe the path of cooperation.

Truly friendly ties should be established among the millions of citizens in our countries and we must not leave unsolved questions for future generations. Of course, a great deal depends on the scientists. However, much depends on us as well. We ought to recall the Leninist formulation of the tasks of the press: to be the collective organizer, and to create and form social opinion.

Allow me to cite two examples from my own experience. I went to Brest to look at a plant: they showed me the front-ranking worker, what the production technology was, and surrounding it all—the normal disorder. Completely unabashed—true, this was long ago—the deputy director said: "Well, as you can see, we are not hiding anything from you." It was implied that the guest himself should understand that, when he has been invited, he should not start criticizing friends. However, this is our reality...

In the second case, I was in Moscow, talking to an advisor for our trade delegation: I wanted his counterargument in connection with the talk of the alleged unprofitability of our cooperation. We sell a ship to the Soviet Union, they say, because they will not take anything else of ours, but if the Soviet Union buys it, it is sold at half price. The advisor responded that he was not required to provide me with any argument whatsoever, because there was a "trade secret," a state secret. I was told that the journal could only quote the communique: talks on cooperation have gone successfully and with full mutual understanding between the parties. A very convenient form, which shuts us up! Yet we ought to be expressing the interests of society, which wants to know at what price we are selling, and at what we are buying. After all, in the final account, the sum of the country's foreign debt will tell us.

[Stanislaw Stefanski] All too often, the term "aid" is used to describe a feature of our relations, and not only by journalists. This causes misunderstanding. It really was aid, actually one-sided, in the first postwar years. Now, however, normal trade and production relations, in which rigid economic rules take first priority, exist between our countries. We journalists often try to ease

our task and, instead of analyzing the economic essence of the events taking place, write about aid and friendship and substitute phrases for fact.

[Jan Cichocki] That is because it had been forbidden for a long time to say anything negative about our friends. We were afraid even to talk about overcoming difficulties... We ourselves have created self-censorship, our own worst enemy.

[Jerzy Rakowski] In my opinion, this is a matter of the wording in our propaganda. Every treaty existing between our countries is referred to as aid. We even say: "CEMA—this is only aid." Why "only aid?" We trade with each other.

[Stanislaw Stefanski] So, all the same, just where in particular are the weaknesses in our journalistic work manifested?

We cooperate broadly with APN, which often prepares articles to fill our needs. However, we receive materials which do not meet our interests just as frequently. Really, one should always keep mutual interests in view when exchanging material. I think that we are thoroughly qualified to tell our Soviet colleagues precisely what interests Polish society, when it is a question of the changes in the Soviet Union.

Many questions relate to "blank spots" in the history of our relations. However, we understand that concentrated interest in these problems is an unhealthy tendency. The declaration, having named this a task which requires a solution, has attracted society's attention to the problem and we should find answers for these questions. The main thing is more information. Not long ago a colleague returned from the Soviet Union. He had been in Kazakhstan, where he was asked: how do the Poles utilize the Soviet Union's aid? While answering, he realized, from the implications of other questions, that in many of his interlocutors' minds the aid to Poland was a cause of the economic problems in the Soviet Union. What a paradox! Here we are asking: are things so bad here because the Soviet Union takes from us, but does not pay as much as it should?

It seems to us that certain truths are having trouble penetrating previous stereotypes, and are with difficulty reaching the minds of the people and sinking into their memory.

Therefore, it is most important to expand the volume of information, which will help to clarify the problem. It is a matter of a properly understood offensive. Let me explain. I have a criticism of both the Soviet and the Polish press: we explain some things and defend our positions from attacks by Western propaganda, but we ourselves are not trying to attack the antagonist. Even in a period when we are achieving successes in disarmament and international cooperation, we do not have the right not to defend our positions in the ideological area.

There can be no ideological coexistence, and we must remember this. When I read the Soviet press, I get the impression that this theme is lacking.

[Viktor Gribachev] We have already mentioned "blank spots." One of these occurred because we poorly and barely covered everything related to the "Solidarity" movement. Jerzy has been in the Soviet Union, and during that time he was asked: is it really true that hundreds, tens of hundreds, thousands of Poles are calling for the overthrow of socialism? Yes, it is our own journalistic fault... Does one not get the impression that up to now we have not eliminated this "blank spot" for our reader? There have been "blank spots" even in more distant history, but the young generation in the Soviet Union has grown up one-sidedly evaluating recent Polish events.

[Jan Cichocki] Many problems have already been outlined. Since we have adopted the Polish-Soviet declaration, why not create a permanent working agency which would coordinate coverage of all the main topics and help to organize goal-oriented journalistic trips to both countries?

[Jerzy Rakowski] Of course, we are professionals, and at this table we can discuss whence all the trouble comes. Our special correspondents' trips to the Soviet Union are poor precisely from a professional viewpoint. The duration of a business trip is 7 or, as an exception, 10 days. Geography? To get somewhere, after all, you have to fly from Warsaw to Moscow and catch a plane—in Moscow. Before this, there is the so-called "protocol," which is why only 2-3 days remain for work. It ends up being like a gallop through Europe. The journalist spends 2 hours at a plant, 2 hours with the gorispolkom, and then at yet another place... He then returns here to the editors, bringing his material, and we tell him: this should be more in-depth, comrade, deep thought is necessary. If we are now addressing our own problems, I would say that this is the most important problem for our editors and journalists' unions.

[Leonid Toporkov] The question of rejecting these rushed visits was raised a long time ago. A Polish journalist could come and work for 2-3 months at an oblast editorial board or, perhaps, a rayon newspaper, and write, which we consider in-depth. Naturally, the rayon and oblast newspaper need material every day. This means that every day he would meet with people and see the rayon's problems and how restructuring is really going. However, restructuring is complex. Not long ago, on the staff of a editors' brigade from the newspaper RECH POSPOLITA, I had occasion to go to Khelm and meet with readers. From them, I found out what they expect both from Polish newspapers and from the Soviet mass information media. The Poles wanted to associate more with the Soviet people, to see how we live and to become familiar with our experience. We are also

interested in finding out about many things. Unfortunately, for the time being our readers know only the official, "toned down" life of Poland.

[Stanislaw Stefanski] The suggestion on longer business trips for our journalists is good, since, when you sit in a strange editorial office along with the journalists who work there, you begin to understand their problems. Material written, for example, by a Soviet journalist, might be used as reserve knowledge for one's own article. After all, in order to understand a problem, one must stay longer and experience it. In my opinion, this form of cooperation is ideal. We should strive for it, but we should also be realistic: a business trip does have a clearly set duration.

Really, do we not set out inadequately prepared to work on a defined topic? We should read the literature earlier and, in particular, ask ourselves the questions: why am I going, what do I want to find out, what do I want to write about, what in particular interests me? Meanwhile, our old custom now weighs upon us: we take several topics right away and then, after returning, we report on how many articles were written. That is the way it is done it here... One has brought back seven articles, another has nine, and they brandish them proudly. But what do these nine articles contain? For me, as editor in chief, the quality of the materials is the most important. Please, let there be just one or two large reports or, if someone is able—three, but such which would expand our knowledge of already well-known phenomena and problems. However, if it is redundant...

Comrade Rakowski spoke completely truthfully: we cannot go "in-depth," for instance, at the rayon, not to mention the countryside, level. There are various reasons. In PRZYJAZN and the Polish press we provide more information about resolutions of a general nature or we reprint articles from Soviet publications and we use "hot" topics of a sensational nature.

[Leonid Toporkov] It would be a good idea for young people to work for 3-4 months in another country, so that they could return there later as correspondents. Moreover, one should love the country in which one works and relate to the people there with sympathy.

[Jerzy Rakowski] I would like to say a few words to sum up our meeting. If this meeting is not continued it will yield nothing. Furthermore, why are only specialists on international affairs talking? We obviously do not have enough discussions on internal topics.

[Stanislaw Stefanski] No such final statements are required. We are giving an account of our shortcomings and cannot plead objective difficulties. We spoke in part about using the term "aid." This is our journalistic aid and participation in restructuring—showing the difficulties and ways to overcome them, supporting the people. We must create conditions under which work would go more easily for people.

13362

Uzbek CP Plans Changes in Publication of Official Reports

18300299 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 4 Jun 88 p 1

[Official announcement: "In the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan: On the Publication of Local Official Materials in the Republic Press"]

[Text] The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan has adopted a resolution concerning the publication of local official materials in the republic press.

It is noted that the publication of local official materials in the republic's media is being carried out in most cases in an outmoded manner which is now evoking justifiable complaints from readers. The published official materials are often quite long. This is especially true of the accounts of sessions of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the republic's Council of Ministers. The publication of some materials simultaneously in all newspapers seems unwarranted. There are inadequacies not only in the presentation of the official materials, but also in their content, depth, specificity and critical tendencies.

Together with the editors of the republic's newspapers and magazines, and taking into account the opinions of readers, society and party organizations, the Propaganda and Agitation Department, and the General Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan are given two months to work out proposals for radically improving the publication of official materials and to submit these proposals to the Central Committee Bureau of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan for subsequent publication in the republic's press.

Greater Access, Better Care of State Archives Demanded

18000391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 4

[Article by V. Molchanov: "Not Only to Protect: Non-traditional Reflections in Connection With an Anniversary"]

[Text] It has been 70 years since V. I. Lenin signed the decree "On the Reorganization and Centralization of Archives in the RSFSR."

An anniversary. Let us remember Vladimir Ilyich's well-known advice from a PRAVDA article published 6-7 November 1921 to the effect that the best way to celebrate an anniversary is to focus attention on unaccomplished objectives.

But during a conversation with Prof. F. Vaganov, doctor of historical sciences and director of the USSR Council of Ministers' Main Archives Administration, it was somehow awkward to recall this advice. During almost the entire time set aside for our conversation, Fedor Mikhaylovich talked about the successes of the service entrusted to him. Of course, pleasant figures are charming and pleasing to the ear. 340 million documents are concentrated in archival depositories. More than 155,000 reports have been sent to various organizations. Nearly 6,000 exhibits devoted to anniversary dates have been held.

That is how our conversation, or rather the archivist's monologue, went. An attempt to stop the inspired lecture and shift it to another, self-critical footing, failed to produce any results. We look at our watch. Time flies! Fedor Mikhaylovich stood up and respectfully hinted; the meeting was over.

Literally on the go, by speaking rapidly, I managed to ask several questions that had arisen following my meetings with scholars, who have accumulated a good many complaints against the archivists.

"How many collections are there that are still closed to researchers?" "Out of 340 million cases, 320 million are open. Please, please!"

"Do you have any plans to revive the magazine ISTO-RICHESKIY ARKHIV, which earned popularity among readers?" "Why? We already have plenty historical magazines, as it is."

"Will the orders of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief about which historians have raised questions be published?" "What is such an interest connected with? We have done a great deal, as it is, to demean the significance of our great victory over fascism."

And my request to briefly tell about the course of restructuring in archival affairs went completely unanswered. Fedor Mikhaylovich only said: "Good-bye. I'm expected."

That is how the interview went. More precisely, did not go. Evidently the old habit, about which the satirical poet caustically wrote, was at work: "When an anniversary comes, unction is poured on the person whose anniversary it is."

Incidentally, the archive guardians' antipathy for historians who poke their noses where they supposedly should not be is manifested rather openly. Here is an episode that occurred at a recent all-union conference in the Central Archives of the Soviet Army. The archives director M. Stegantsev was angrily dressing down the well-known historian V. Polikarpov, who, you see, was "demanding documents, and it is forbidden to show them without special authorization of the General Staff. There is a directive from the Ministry of Defense to that effect."

"It is dated 1981," said Doctor of Historical Sciences V. D. Polikarpov. "So much time has passed, and so many changes, but evidently nothing at all has changed at the archives. I wasn't able to obtain a 1919 document at the time. It turns out that approval by the General Staff is needed. So-called 'restricted access,' introduced during the years of stagnation, is still in effect. Many military archives from the time of the Civil War are still inaccessible to historians."

"If a researcher obtains documents with the authorization of a given department," continued Doctor of Historical Sciences Yu. I. Korablev, "he cannot cite them in his own works. Why, say, is our history of the Red Army of those years somehow 'uninhabited' by human beings? The same names keep appearing in various books. Yet during the years of the Civil War the Order of the Red Banner, a sign of special courage, was awarded to 15,000 people. Notices of decoration were submitted for 30,000 soldiers and officers. What do we know about them? Only that bureaucrats find such prohibitions to their advantage: the more that is closed, the more tranquil things are for them. Even the popular Politizdat series 'Flaming Revolutionaries' is withering. The authors need documents—they can't produce their stories out of thin air."

At the Central Archives of the USSR National Economy there are 730,000 personal cases under "restricted access." In order to examine the materials, say, of the brothers Leonid, Viktor and Aleksandr Vesnin, famous architects, one must go for authorization to the USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs. One can study the documents on the life and work of that talented industrial organizer I. F. Tevosyan if one gets a pass certified in the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy.

And here is the opinion of senior archivist Ya. I. Aleksandrov:

"Archives staff members have no interest in opening collections. 'Secrecy' is profitable for them—they get a 15-percent addition to their salaries for it. Moreover, we ourselves, the archivists, do not always know what collections are open, and we have no list of the cases that have become accessible. Guides to the collections have not yet been created. People have forgotten that archives are a research center. Our research-methods department has even been eliminated. Only one function has been left for archivists—to protect."

And just how are the documents kept?

The archives staff members claim: poorly! The buildings of the depositories that make up the archives campus on Pirogovskaya Street have no air conditioners or moisture regulators. There is mold on the walls. The thin, fragile paper is being destroyed, and the text becoming illegible. It is already impossible to read millions of sheets, even with a magnifying glass.

A year ago a commission of the Main Archives Administration studied the depository of film documents in Krasnogorsk. You read the report and you are horrified! Negatives and prints have been placed in cellars that are flooded with water. More than 70 percent of the extremely valuable materials have turned out to be "unstable," or simply speaking, spoiled. They include the first documentary films of Russian cinema. Film materials from the All-Russian Congresses of Soviets and meetings of the Third Comintern Congress, at which V. I. Lenin spoke, have been damaged.

Eighteen months ago V. Tsaplin, director of the Central Archives of the National Economy, sent department executives a letter proposing that the archives' work be evaluated not on the basis of "gross output"—the number of documents stored—as it presently is, but according to the level of their use in historical scholarship, in the national economy, and for purposes of propaganda. Vsevolod Vasilyevich, along with his associates, had thoroughly thought through methods for introducing cost accounting and a partially self-support operation in archival affairs.

"But the main administration remains silent," regrets V. Tsaplin.

"Contrived," replied F. Vaganov, when I asked him about the fate of those proposals.

Scholars have long raised the question of reviving the magazine *ISTORICHESKIY ARKHIV*.

"The magazine would introduce a fresh stream into the work of archivists," claims S. O. Shmidt, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Archeographic Committee. "It would help them work creatively and strive to

publish documents in the pages of that magazine. But evidently what suits the main administration is paper shuffling and the routine organization of work—just so its bureaucratic orders are carried out."

The fate of the archives, depositories of the people's memory, concerns the public at large and scholars. Recently PRAVDA editors received a letter from Academicians S. Tikhvinskiy, Yu. Kukushkin, I. Mints, A. Narochnitskiy, Yu. Bromley, I. Kovalchenko and other prominent scholars. They are concerned that in a number of union republics, "under the banner of restructuring," archives are being transferred to the control of the Ministry of Justice. The only motive is to reduce the managerial apparatus.

S. Belyakov and I. Novopashin, senior researchers of documents, side with the scholars' view: "This sort of 'reform,'" they write, "is being carried out in the quiet of offices. No one has consulted specialists who have devoted their whole lives to archival work."

There's no disputing the fact that reduction of the apparatus is a necessary thing. But the scholars rightfully believe that it is not an end in itself. The main thing is to bring about a situation in which our archives become centers for the study and publicizing of the historical and cultural riches that are concentrated in their depositories. A situation in which they work for restructuring.

8756

Georgian Party Historian on 'Truth'; Lists Purge Victims

18300306 [Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 12 March 1988 carries on page 3 under the title, "The Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing But the Truth. Some Issues and Problems of the Science of Party History" a 3500-word article by Professor Devi Sturua, director of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee's Party History Institute, concerning the tasks of the professional party historian (as contrasted with, say, those of the journalist or literary man) in light of Gorbachev's admonitions at the February Plenum, several quotes from which are cited.

For years, in particular after the advent of Stalin's "Short Course" but even after the 20th Congress, party historians were reduced to simply mouthing the "authoritarian" line. They still lag behind the demands of perestroika and glasnost, while journalists, writers, and social scientists in other disciplines pour out a plethora of information and analysis of the past—much of it, unfortunately, contradictory, slanted, and even wrong. "They have the right to do so (several such authors are named, all of them Russian)—but professional historians do not. The party's call for truth—"is sincere this time," and it will not do to "go from one extreme to another" in dealing with the facts of historical interpretation. As an example of going to the opposite extreme,

Sturua refers to "some writers" who are asking whether socialism, industrialization, and collectivism were even necessary, whether in fact the Soviet Union provoked the attack by fascist Germany, etc.

The author devotes lengthy passages to the sufferings of Georgia and the Georgians in the 1930's, and lists many names of prominent victims of Stalin's repressions. They include old bolsheviks Abel and Siumon Enukidze, Mamia Orakhelashvili, Shalva Eliava, Lavrenti Kartvelishvili, Beso Lominadze, Levan Gogoberidze, Mikheil Kakhiani, Eprem Eshba, Vladimer Ladaria, Samson Mamulia, Vladimer Dzhikia, Shamshe Lezhava, Andro Dolidze, Vano Bolkvadze, Isak Zhvania, Arakel Okuashvili "and others." Several names in that category are singled out because they had earlier confessed their errors and been reinstated to party posts: Budu Mdivani, Mikheil, Nikoloz, and Shalva Okudzhava, Razhden Kaladze; Lado Dumbadze.

Military men who fell victim to the purges included Tevdore "Soso" Buachidze, Petre Kutateladze, Nikoloz Bluashvili, "and others." Numerous writers and arts figures perished: Sandro Akhmeteli, Evgeni Mikeladze, Titsian Tabidze, Paolo Iashvili, Mikheil Dzhavakhishvili, and others. A number of outstanding figures in the arts and sciences are listed as having been "persecuted" but not necessarily executed: Davit Kakabadze, Lado Gudishvili, Zakaria Paliashvili, Ivane Dzhavakhishvili, Ivane Beritashvili, Simon Kaukhchishvili, Shalva Nutsubidze, Ekvtime Takaishvili, Vukol Beridze, and others. The roster of intellectuals who perished continues with Grigol Tsereteli, Vakhtang Kotetishvili, Shalva Tsintsadze, Kita Megrelidze, and Mose Gogiberidze. Giorgi Gvakharia, a brilliant industrialist who made a seminal contribution to Soviet metallurgy (he headed the Makeyevka Metallurgy Combine for a time) also perished.

Brief mention is made of "the infamous Mingrelian Affair," of the early 1950's, one of whose figures, Nino Zhvania, was arrested as a Turkish spy and charged with having connections to [exiled menshevik leader] Noe Zhordania.

Another denounces those "philistines" who swallow published anti-Georgian nonsense such as I. Sofron's article in OGONEK No 3, 1988, in which he claims that Georgians did not suffer in the 1930's and hence view those historical events from a different angle.

On the question of Stalin and how to explain him, Professor Sturua notes a number of Russian writers who are attempting that task with a kind of psychohistorical approach—which, the author emphasizes, is out of bounds to the serious historian. Sturua suggests that it is wrong to blame the whole tragic period on Stalin's character, the man and his deeds divorced from the era in which he lived. In the 1930's, to be sure, the "subjective factor" was paramount. But in the 1920's, the young Soviet state was objectively alone in a sea of counter-revolution, backwardness, Trotskyism, and other perils. Lenin's invective against Kautsky and his doctrines are quoted briefly, as is his declaration during the period of war communism that "Soviet power is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois republic." Despite these objective factors, Sturua acknowledges that there was no excuse for the "restrictions on democracy" and "near-military party discipline" of the 1920's. Still, Lenin was a model of leniency with those who opposed him—Bukharin, for example—compared to Stalin.

In a brief passage, Sturua admits that it is hard for him personally to confess all this, for his generation grew up as faithful Stalinists. In the quest now to right the wrongs of past historiography, however, scientific objectivity must not be replaced by "hysterical convulsions." In this context, he denounces those (unnamed) social scientists and literary men, who, "desiring that their readers not know everything" covertly or overtly attack the path of our party's history, citing without quotes some of the doctrines of Trotsky and drawing upon the writings of Avtorkhanov, Conquest, Pipes, and Deutscher.

In conclusion, Professor Sturua notes that the institute he heads is preparing a new "Sketch [ocherki] of the History of the Georgian Communist Party." The work will draw on all primary sources and archives; discussions will be held on topics like Lenin's nationality policy in Transcaucasia, the "national-uklonisty," and so on.

**ZNAMYA Chief Editor Takes on Recent
Defenders of Stalinism**

18000394a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in
Russian 26 May 88 p 6

[Interview with Grigoriy Baklanov, by Ye. Grandova,
under rubric "Discussions With the Writer": "About a
Right Cause and Imaginary Truths"]

[Text] The editorial office of ZNAMYA magazine is
situated in the very center of the capital, not far from Red
Square. The sound of the chimes carries into the open
office windows. And this is symbolic: the collective that is
headed by Soviet writer Grigoriy Baklanov is not lagging
behind the time, but is intensely living for today and
working for the future.

Our discussion with the writer dealt with the problems of
life, the ways to overcome them, and the lessons of the
past.

[Question] Grigoriy Yakovlevich, every day life teaches
us instructive lessons. For example, the article in
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA that raised such a fuss—the
article under the rubric "Letter to the Newspaper"—
clearly indicated that fighting for perestroika means
fighting for people's souls, for the consolidation of those
who understand that we do not have any way available to
us other than perestroika. But, unfortunately, everyone
does not understand that, and there are many of those
who do not want to understand and who do not want any
changes.

Meanwhile there exists the opinion (as is attested to by
the readers' letters) that there is no great harm in
publishing that item: the feeling is that the person had
expressed his own personal opinion, and that is provided
for by glasnost and democracy. What do you think about
this?

[Answer] I think that no one should have the monopoly
right to criticism. Glasnost is glasnost for everyone.
Everyone has the right to express his opinion freely. But
there is no such thing as freedom without responsibility.
I would even say that the broader the freedom, the
greater the personal responsibility, otherwise freedom
for me and for you turns into lack of freedom for all the
others. Our society has experienced this, and we know
how things happen and what this leads to. But the article
in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is definitely against glas-
nost. It is precisely glasnost that the article demands
discontinuing. And even as a warning it was mentioned
that at one time for "writings" (which, incidentally,
when compared with those being printed currently in our
country, are absolutely innocent), people were exiled
from our country. Why should one be surprised that the
article evoked such a storm of indignant letters from
readers? And something else that repels us is that the
entire article was built on lies.

Our editorial office received a letter from Leningrad,
from a person who had been very close both to Nina
Andreyeva and her husband. And he writes that this was
definitely not a letter from Nina Andreyeva, as had been
stated in the newspaper. Just send a correspondent out to
visit her, he said, and you will be convinced. Even before
the article in PRAVDA two journalists attempted to
meet with Andreyeva, but she declined. Why, one might
ask, should she decline if she was the author? No, it
would seem that this was a collective work of creativity,
and in PRAVDA that article had been correctly called a
manifesto of anti-perestroika forces. And an old method
had been used, a method that has already been encoun-
tered in our history. When it was necessary to destroy the
Komsomol Central Committee headed by Kosarev, and
subsequently, when the "doctors' case" arose, everything
had been done in exactly the same way: revelations were
suddenly made by a certain woman who had previously
been relatively unknown or who was completely
unknown to anyone. Then a commotion immediately
developed about them. Those trials are still living in
people's memory. They have not been forgotten. And
those methods have survived also.

Those who are defending Stalin today—or, rather, who
are defending themselves—are actually using Stalin and
Stalinist methods: lies and the juggling of facts play a role
today that is by no means a minor one. For example,
both in that article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and the
letter to OGONEK that was written by M. T. Novikov,
prorector of the Moscow Physical Engineering Institute
(it is interesting that they both coincide in time: both
were published in March) one reads the assertion that
Churchill and Roosevelt stood at "attention" before
Stalin. "Willingly or unwillingly, even such leaders of
great countries as Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Win-
ston Churchill drew themselves up to attention, holding
their hands rigid at their sides," the prorector writes. It
would be beneficial, for purposes of general develop-
ment, if one of the students in one of the lower classes at
Moscow Physical Engineering Institute told his prorector
confidentially that Roosevelt (Franklin Delano), after he
had been stricken by poliomyelitis, had to use a wheel-
chair, and even if he had suddenly got the desire—which
would be so strange for the president of a great country—
to draw himself up to "attention" before Stalin while
"holding his hands rigid at his sides," he would have
simply been physically unable to do that.

But what actually happened? Could it have been that this
had happened figuratively? No, even in the figurative
sense nothing like this occurred.

We recall that the Allies pledged to open up the Second
Front in 1942, but Churchill postponed that by two
years. All that time he gave as his reason the shortage of
manpower and means, saying that if he were to make a
landing now, that would lead to large losses. Well, other
than the lack of desire to risk his own people, one can
also easily discern here a political game: it was necessary

to defeat Hitler, but it was also necessary to have the Soviet Union emerge from the war extremely weakened, and then, in the postwar world, to dictate one's will.

As for the shortage of means, the Allies' landing in Africa (instead of opening up the Second Front in Europe) and Operation Torch were so well provided with all combat means and technology that "the first aircraft delivered dentists' chairs to Algiers." It was Churchill who wrote that. I am quoting from his six-volume work "The Second World War," because it was precisely Churchill who had become fashionable. In that operation, one vehicle—including combat vehicles, armored vehicles, tanks, and artillery—required 4.77 British or American soldiers. But at that very time our female medics were required not only to take a wounded person off the field of combat, but also were required to take his rifle too—without his rifle, he would not be admitted to the medical battalion. I shall not discuss now how we got to that point, because enough has already been written about it and even more will continue to be written.

But here is one wartime episode that I would like to draw the reader's attention to, if only because the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA recommends the two-volume work "Perepiski Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov SSSR s prezidentami SShA i premyer-ministrami Velikobritanii vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941—1945 gg." [Correspondence between the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and the Presidents of the United States of America and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945] as "significant and serious material for reflections... Those documents, truth to tell, evoke pride in our country..."

In December 1944 the German offensive in the Ardennes began, the Allies were getting squeezed, and Churchill told Stalin, "...I would appreciate it if you could tell me whether we can count on a major Russian offensive on the Vistula front or somewhere else..." Our offensive had been planned for later, the weather was not favorable, but Stalin answered, "It is very important to use our superiority over the Germans in artillery and aviation. In these fighting arms it is necessary to have clear weather for the aviation and a lack of low clouds that prevent the artillery from conducting aimed fire..." Nevertheless he gave his assurance that the order would be issued, "...regardless of the weather, to open up broad offensive actions against the Germans along the entire central front no later than the second half of January."

And our offensive began ten days earlier. What did that mean? It meant that all the equipment and ammunition had not been brought up, and shells that had not been brought up meant people's lives. We who experienced in 1941 what the enemy's advantage in the air meant, and who suffered tremendous losses at that time, deprived ourselves in this offensive of our chief advantage. All the references—the history of the Patriotic War, the brief encyclopedia, the complete encyclopedia, the memoirs

written by military leaders—report low clouds and report that we had deprived ourselves of our chief advantage: aviation and aimed artillery fire. The powerful German fortifications were broken through by the infantry at the cost of our lives, and people rushed into the attack, into combat, with the shout "For the Motherland! For Stalin!" We shall never learn how many thousands, or tens of thousands, of people perished then, or how many of them could still be living today, if they had not laid down their lives to break through the fortifications: young men whose lives had only just begun, and fathers whose children were left orphans.

But could it have been that the Allies' situation really was critical and absolutely had to be considered? This was the correlation of forces and means that was cited by Marshal G. K. Zhukov: "...immediately after the opening of the Second Front, the Allies surpassed the enemy with regard to the number of people by a factor of 2; tanks, by a factor of 4; and aircraft, by a factor of 6." But could it be that there could have been problems of strategy that were inaccessible to simple mortals, or brilliant political calculations, and it was for the sake of this that lives were sacrificed?

"I wanted very much to assure that we arrived ahead of the Russians in certain areas of Central Europe," Churchill wrote. "The Hungarians, for example, had expressed their intention to exert resistance to the Soviet advance, but they would have capitulated to British troops if the latter could arrive in time. I wanted very much... to seize and occupy the Istria peninsula and make the attempt to arrive in Vienna ahead of the Russians."

Farther on, he writes: "...The decisive practical questions of strategy and policy that will be discussed... can be summarized as follows:

"first, Soviet Russia had become a mortal threat to the free world";

"secondly, it was necessary immediately to create a new front against its headlong advance;

"thirdly, that front in Europe should extend as far as possible to the East;

"fourthly, the chief and true goal of the Anglo-American armies was Berlin."

Those were Churchill's strategic and political calculations and that is how their implementation was aided by an offensive launched, at the sacrifice of lives of Soviet soldiers, by our "great and wise" leader, before whom, according to his current defenders, both Churchill and Roosevelt stood at attention, with their hands rigid at their sides.

Or could this have been the only military miscalculation made by Stalin, a person who never made miscalculations? "A particularly negative side of Stalin throughout the war was the fact," Marshal Zhukov wrote to V. Sokolov, author of the novel "Vtorzheniye", and that letter would seem not to have been edited as the marshal's memoirs had been, "that, with a poor knowledge of the practical aspect of preparing the operation of a front, army, or troops, he set completely unrealistic deadlines for the beginning of an operation, as a consequence of which many operations began when they had been poorly prepared, the troops suffered unjustified losses, and the operations 'fizzled out' without achieving their goal."

A chief of state, a "father of nations," is obliged to protect his nation, not offer it up for destruction.

And here is yet another last proof—concerning the prewar period. During a visit to Moscow, already past midnight, when, as W. Churchill writes, "we were tasting small quantities of everything, following the Russian custom of sampling numerous and varied dishes, and taking sips of various excellent wines," he asked Stalin the following question.

"'Could you please tell me,' I asked, 'whether the difficulties of this war have had such a heavy effect upon you personally as the carrying out of the policy of collectivization.'

"That topic immediately enlivened the marshal.

"'No,' he said, 'the policy of collectivization was a terrible struggle.'

"'I would have thought that you consider it to be difficult,' I said, 'since you were dealing not with several tens of thousands of aristocrats or major landlords, but with millions of small people.'

"'With ten million,' he said, lifting his hands. 'It was terrible. It lasted four years...'

"'Those were the people whom you called kulaks?'

"'Yes,' he said, without repeating that word...

"'What happened?' I asked.

"'Well,' he answered, 'many of them agreed to go along with us. Some of them were given land for individual cultivation in Tomsk Oblast or in Irkutsk Oblast, or even farther to the north, but most of them were extremely unpopular, and they were killed by their own farmhands.'"

Then Churchill writes, "...I remember what a strong impression was exerted on me at that time by the report that millions of men and women were being destroyed or resettled forever... I did not repeat Burke's aphorism, 'If I cannot carry out reforms without justice, then I do not need the reforms.'"

One can analyze in this manner every paragraph of the article in the 13 March issue of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and every paragraph contains camouflaged lies. Stalin had victories, but they were victories over his own nation, bloody victories. Not Churchill and not Roosevelt, we stood at attention in front of him: life as a whole, thought, and people. The country's economy also stood with its "hands rigid at its sides." And we are feeling the results now.

[Question] Grigoriy Yakovlevich, you have concentrated your attention on the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and yet in the April issues of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and NASH SOVREMENNİK magazines, which had been signed to press in March, there were articles that, on the basis of meaning and argumentation, expressed solidarity with the statement in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

[Answer] Yes, you're right. It's a kind of salvo. In general, experience is supposed to teach us. You might possibly remember how the hounding of Tvardovskiy was organized at one time. That was a time when public life had begun to get farther and farther away from the line set down by the party's 20th Congress, but Tvardovskiy and NOVYY MIR magazine, to which he gave his life until his last days, remained true to the party line set down by the congress. And so a coordinated salvo was fired: statements were made by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, and LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. The first to fire a shot was OGONEK, which was headed at that time by A. Sofronov: the famous letter signed by 11 writers opened that campaign.

Yuriy Trifonov and I wrote a letter in reply—at that time there were very few defenders of NOVYY MIR—and carried it to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. The first deputy editor in chief was another person. He received us. He read the letter. He said, "I hope you understand that I must report this," and pointed to the telephones. "Yes, we understand." "We were supposed to have some kind of discussion... Of course, you understand that that discussion will not occur." "I understand," I said. "We have something here about your creative plans... I hope you understand..." "I understand," Trifonov said. But there was no mention of having our letter printed. We sent a copy to Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy in the hospital, so that he would sense at least our small support. And from him, in the hospital, I received a letter that was written in his own hand, a letter that was surprising in its strength of spirit and in its foresight.

Recently rumors have been circulating, to the effect that one of the eleven persons who signed the letter regrets having done so and even to the effect that someone has made a private statement on that score. But then there's the article by M. Lobanov in the previously mentioned issue No. 4 of NASH SOVREMENNİK. On the basis of methodology it is very similar to the article in SOVETS-KAYA ROSSIYA. There Churchill is accepted as an ally and has someone else's statement ascribed to him, but in this one a certain Frenchman asked,

"People have written—both in our country and outside its limits—about A. Tvardovskiy's departure from NOVYY MIR. But a certain influential French commentator, Robelle, wrote in LETTRES FRANCAISES magazine (December 1970) that the chief event in Soviet literature was the departure not of A. Tvardovskiy from NOVYY MIR (which, we might add, has already exhausted itself), but of A. V. Nikonov from MOLODAYA GVARDIYA. Time has shown that those events proved to be of truly different importance."

Well, it's correct that the Frenchman had been taken in, but who among us would say such nonsense? Something else is interesting: did M. Lobanov, a well-known enemy of everything that was foreign—and especially, western—really turn suddenly to the West for assistance? Couldn't he find any willing allies in his own Motherland? Or is everything fair in war? But against whom was he fighting the war? Just place up against this bitter laughter such commensurable names and you can judge what is the greater loss for literature, and consequently for the life of the nation: the departure of Tvardovskiy, or—excuse me—Nikonov...

Working as a writer is a dangerous matter. A person thinks that he is writing about someone else, but actually he unknowingly writes things about himself that he seemingly would not admit to under torture. I think that not a single critic, even the meanest one, or a single ill-wisher has yet written about M. Lobanov what he has now said about himself by this article.

It sometimes happens that articles are not always sent to all members of the editorial board: some have read it, but others have not. But the magazine's editor in chief is required to read them. He signs the magazine. During the life of Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy, one of the persons who signed that shameful letter to OGONEK was S. Vikulov. Today, when Tvardovskiy is no longer among the living and people are collecting money for a monument to Vasilii Terkin—in other words, for a monument to their great poet—S. Vikulov signed his name to a magazine containing an article in which Lobanov attempts to belittle Tvardovskiy posthumously. Everything is continuing.

All that remains is to add one more curious detail. As everyone knows, a lie always tries to look like the truth. A detail that has the guise of accuracy, or a date, does not immediately produce an impression on the uninitiated,

does not cause him to have any doubts. In M. Lobanov's article, it is not simply that the words of the "influential French commentator" were paraphrased, but it is also stated that they were printed in LETTRES FRANCAISES, and even, as though incidentally, the reference was given in parentheses: "(December 1970)." A simple check has shown that nothing of the kind was printed in the December issue of LETTRES FRANCAISES. Is this the work of an apprentice? Or could it be that there wasn't any apprentice at all?

What a strange coincidence of methods!

[Question] To a large degree, literature is called upon to tell people the truth. Recently we have seen a rather large number of works that thoroughly reveal the essence of events that occurred in the past and also that are occurring at the present time. Those works point out to us social types of persons which were previously unknown to us. Simultaneously there have been disputes about the measure of artistic merit and social content in literature. What is your attitude to such discussions?

[Answer] Are these really discussions? Rather, they have the appearance of discussions. It is like putting on a scientific air while pounding water in a mortar and pestle. Just imagine if, during the war, when the question of whether we were going to live or die was being decided, there had been a widespread discussion of whether a writer should wait until his highly developed prose matures, or whether, in any form—poetry, a leaflet, or an article on a matter of current social interest—he should tell the public an inspiring word. And how many writers at that time picked up not a pen, but a rifle!

We shall make no attempt to be deceptive: the fate of the Homeland is being resolved today. Either we shall create a dynamic democratic society in which the greatest value is placed on labor and talent and on the citizen's devotion to his Homeland, rather than personal devotion; either we shall create a self-adjusting economic mechanism that is receptive to everything that is innovational, a mechanism that promotes people with initiative and dynamic energy and that will enable us to go out to the world markets and to sell the products of our labor, multiplying our wealth—in a word, either we shall create that to which perestroika is leading us, or we shall see the reinforcement of an administrative system that operates on the basis of orders issued by administrators who very frequently are completely unknowledgeable, since the system that has prevailed for many years in selecting people to fill positions has been such that the wrong people have passed through many sieves. If this happens—if, once again, there is stagnation, the final loss of people's energy and trust, and the most complete sluggishness of the economic mechanism—we shall roll backward, and other countries will inevitably be enabled to plunder our country, buying up cheaply our raw materials, our irreplaceable wealth, the property of our children and grandchildren. It is "either-or." There is no

middle way. And everyone has to be evaluated today on the basis of how he—how he personally—is helping the perestroika. If writing on social and political matters helps people to become aware of the time, is that really so bad? Isn't this quality?

But here is another example: V. Dudintsev's novel "White Clothing", A. Rybakov's novel "Children of the Arbat", A. Pristavkin's short story "A Little Gold Cloud Spent the Night", and D. Granin's short story "The Bison" have exerted a large influence upon the social atmosphere as a whole. The reader's interest in these books has been tremendous: some people receive them enthusiastically, and others reject them violently. There is nothing surprising about this. These books deal with problems that are too serious and painful. They deal with absolutely basic matters. A few writers attempted not to notice these matters at all, and it was as though such books did not exist. Well, this is understandable, because even people with a certain amount of talent can possess human weaknesses. But gradually a chorus of voices developed: this is the writing of fiction, this is sociopolitical journalism, they are artistically imperfect... Good God, what zealous supporters of artistic style they were! For years, for decades, they endured colorless, untalented novels without frowning, they praised them, but now, all of a sudden, their refined artistic taste has broken through, and their "conscience" could withstand it no more.

But let us assume that one of these books is completely fictional or journalistic, and let us also assume even that it reflects temporary, rather than eternal, interests for mankind as a whole, although this verdict will be made only by time, rather than by contemporaries. But, at any rate, let us assume. What then? "In order to have the strength to take those tremendous steps forward that our society took recently, it had to be unilateral, it had to be attracted farther than the goal in order to reach it, it had to see that one goal ahead of it. And actually, could one have thought about poetry at that time when we saw opening up before our eyes for the first time the picture of the evil that was surrounding us and we were given the opportunity to rid ourselves of it. How could we think of the beautiful when things were becoming painful! We who enjoy the fruits of that enthusiasm should not be reproached for this. The unconscious needs for respect toward literature that have become widespread in society, the public opinion that has arisen, and I might even say the self-government that our political literature replaced us with—those are the fruits of this noble enthusiasm."

Won't you agree that this sounds very up to the minute, as though it had been stated yesterday? Well, it is a quotation from Lev Tolstoy, from a speech of his that he made at the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature in 1959, during a period that was so tempestuous for Russia. Yes, he knew that "The literature of the nation is its complete, thorough consciousness, in which there

must be an identical reflection both of the people's love for good and truth, and the people's contemplation of beauty at a certain era of development."

Can it be that our zealous supporters of "high art" do not know all this? Of course they do. They all know it. Nevertheless they suddenly begin to oppose those books, those authors, with other authors—for example, literature about the village. Are these really two different literatures? Two different peoples? During a critical era one ought not to subdivide the people and its literature. One ought not to oppose certain people to others or put up walls between them. A great goal is achieved only by a single striving by the entire nation.

[Question] Grigoriy Yakovlevich, doesn't it seem to you that the critics of the writers whom you have mentioned are upset most of all not by motivations of a literary nature, but of a political nature? So to speak, "do not dig up old graves—they are fraught with new misfortune..."

[Answer] It would seem to be so. The means and arguments are different, but the goal is the same. People say, for example, that in order to describe the events that shook our country we need a new Shakespeare! But we do not have any Shakespeare among us, so are we supposed to wait 300 years more? Or, we should first let the historians analyze the situations, and then let the writers go to work. But what are we supposed to do if the historians have been dragging their feet for so long? Or people say, for example, that nothing really depended upon the individual, because, as everyone knows, history is created by the masses, our history traveled along its own path, nothing else could have happened, and in general the laws of history are like the laws of astronomy—they are irreversible, just as the movement of the heavenly bodies is irreversible... But we are well aware that if Lenin had lived even, say, ten years more, the economic policy of which he was the far-sighted creator would not have been violently interrupted, and would have existed. And our country would not have experienced the bloody tragedies of the Stalinist times.

The person who perhaps went farther than anyone else in this regard was V. Kozhinov, in an article "modestly" called "Truthfulness and Truth" in the April issue of NASH SOVREMENNİK. And this is the "truth" that he revealed: Stalin was the completely natural consequence of the revolution; if he had not existed, there would have been someone else just like him; Lenin foresaw all of this; he knew all of this ahead of time and was moving toward it...

V. Kozhinov is a Dostoyevskii expert, and he, of course, remembers the words of the Great Inquisitor: "...you give bread, and a person bows down, since there is nothing more incontrovertible than bread, but if, at the same time, anyone gets control of his conscience against you, then he will even throw away your bread and will follow after the person who will seduce his conscience."

It is not truth that V. Kozhinov seeks. His article is one of the attempts to seduce people's conscience, to incite wrath, and to channel it along a false trail. What must be carried in one's soul to ensure that the victims of 1937 (people say that they themselves were guilty of everything, so why pity them?) can be opposed to the victims of collectivization and the subsequent starvation! To push not only the living, but also the dead! How can one fail to see that trainloads of families of dispossessed kulaks, and later, during the years that followed, trainloads of nationalities that had been exiled—were all links in one and the same evil chain, and the creator of everything was one and the same? "Our odes did not sing about the fact that/During this evil hour, disdaining the law/He could bring down upon entire nations/His supreme wrath..." Is it not because of this poetic insight of his that there are today certain people who do not like Tvardovskiy?

No, it was not during our days of glasnost that our national problems arose. They are all the consequence of those years.

[Question] Grigoriy Yakovlevich, my last question might seem not to pertain to the topic of our discussion. Nevertheless it does have its own logic. Could you tell me what your attitude is toward awards?

[Answer] When people perform high civic exploits, actions of military valor, or unexampled labor for the good of the Homeland, they should be singled out and given awards, so that their fellow citizens can be proud of them and follow their worthy example. But in awards, as in life, the thing that is needed most of all is justice. People are repelled and perverted when awards are given undeservedly. People are ashamed to see this. It is belittling for them to realize that their opinion does not mean anything, while the person who has been given the award remains proud regardless.

Brezhev, during his years in office, took away the honor from the award. He gave himself every conceivable decoration and medal—so many that it was physically impossible for him to carry that weight of gold. I remember that in 1966—22 years after Victory Day—when he was awarded his first Gold Star as Hero of the Soviet Union, a slightly tipsy person—possibly a front-liner—asked loudly from a trolleybus, "What's he been doing all this time, sitting in a dug-out? Did they just discover him there?" But people kept shoving things at him to sign, so that he would have the opportunity to keep getting these innumerable awards...

Of course, the spirit of ingratiating oneself did not arise today. In official Russia all of this was known and even too well elaborated: mentioning oneself promptly, not meriting something, but soliciting for it... But the Russian intelligentsia was not distinguished by a spirit of ingratiating oneself. That was considered to be

shameful! But that spirit of ingratiating oneself penetrated into the midst of our writers and the creative intellectuals and it produced lush inflorescences. And we may as well admit that to this day that spirit has not dissipated.

One of the myths of our time consists in the view that previously everything was just. It was strict, but just. And in general, we cannot live without strictness. A firm hand is needed, and only then do we begin to "understand." N. A. Nekrasov wrote simply about this philosophy: "People with the rank of serfs are sometimes downright curs: the harder the punishment, the more lovable the master is to them"...

And it was like that: we returned from the war, and in recognition of their combat decorations the decorated servicemen were paid some small amount of money. At this point it would probably be fitting to lower one's eyes shamefully and say: it's not the money, but the principle of the thing... No, in that meager life, that money meant something: for example, for a kolkhoz member who received only "sticks" for his workday, or for a student. I was a student, and for a month or two you wouldn't take it, until a 30-kopeck or 50-kopeck coin had accumulated. With a stipend of 220 rubles at that time, that was money. But soon the money for decoration money was abolished with a single stroke of the pen. And it was not just the money that was taken away, but also the honor: the war is over, and there's our token of gratitude. And immediately the military pensions began to drop too. I came out of the war with a Group III disability: not for shell-shock, but for one of four wounds. And every six months we had to go to be recertified. And every time I went, I saw a miracle being performed: sick, lame, crippled persons would walk through the door into the medical commission, and when they came out of there no longer as persons who had been disabled by the war, but as healthy citizens.

But it was only my left arm that was maimed, and yet the recertification was also required for people who had only a stump of a leg or an arm remaining. And as the former front-liners were awaiting the wise decision, they would joke among themselves, saying, "Well, how have you been doing?" "Well, the arm has been growing back a little bit..." Every six months there was this standing in line in front of the door, this waiting, this mandatory belittlement—that was the award we got for our wounds, for our maimings, for our blood. And you can believe me or not believe me, but I didn't go to the fourth or fifth recertification. I just couldn't go, even though at that time the pension meant a lot to me. Even if I had gone, they would have taken it away from me anyway after a day or two. I've still got the old pension record booklet of those days.

That very spring, at the time when, according to the saying, "the gypsy sells his fur coat," Vladimir Tendryakov and I (we were both in the same year at the Literary Institute, and he had also been disabled in the war) went

to sell my officer's overcoat: I had to live somehow. At the entrance to the flea market we were offered 220 rubles for it: that figure has haunted me. We were offended, we were not going to give it up cheap, and we haggled for about two more hours, but when another dealer offered us the very same 220 rubles, we were as happy as though we had found the money. We immediately bought some fried pirozhki filled with some kind of rotten meat and we returned very happy.

Yes, Stalin did not give himself as many decorations as Brezhnev gave himself: there may have been some things he was not good at, but he was an expert in people's psychology. He was a great expert on human weaknesses and flaws. He had two Gold Stars (not four and not five), but during his time the country was covered with his monuments and images. But as for Marshal Zhukov, the savior of Moscow, where Stalin sat in complete dismay, for some reason he never erected a monument to him. And the country's day began with a eulogy to the leader and also ended with a eulogy to him. Everything that he did was brilliant from its inception, and all the accomplishments of our great and much suffering nation, everything that was ascribed to it, was prostrated at his feet. Can someone else's merits be ascribed to me if I do not want that? Can eulogies emanate from all the loud-speakers from morning to night if that is against my conscience and my convictions? All of this spread through the entire pyramid from top to bottom. The real creators of rocket artillery, the legendary katyusha, were sent to camps, to be shot to death, but the person who signed their denunciation was praised for that and given an award. And what about Vavilov's history? And thousands and thousands of similar histories? Great people receive their rewards, but only posthumously: the more they have suffered during their life, the more brightly their name will shine. But what about ordinary people? They carried away with them from shadow to shadow their sufferings, their pains, their insults, and those pains and insults were no lesser than those of the persons whose name will go down in history.

We must cleanse socialism of everything that has besmirched it. We must return the true meaning to concepts and words: conscience, honor, and human dignity.

5075

Artists Warn of Enduring Stalinist 'Pseudorealism'

18000416 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in
Russian 14 Jun 88 pp 4-5

[Article by A. Chegodayev, doctor of art studies, professor; M. Miturich, People's Artist of the RSFSR, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Arts; G. Poplavskiy, Honored Artist of the BSSR, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Arts; and D. Zhilinskiy, People's Artist of the RSFSR, full member of the USSR Academy of Arts: "To Approximate the Truth"]

[Text] The problems of realism in the fine arts are evidently very disturbing to V. Vanslov, a renowned

specialist in the field of ballet. In recent times he has dealt twice with this topic in the pages of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA: first, in a letter entitled "The Danger Lies Not Just in Grey Mediocrity," and then on 23 April 1988 in an article entitled "On the Breadth of Realism and Its 'Banks'." In this article he develops the idea, which he had previously outlined, of the need to demarcate realism from modernism and to establish precise boundaries for realism.

The concept of realism, V. Vanslov writes, "is of sufficient scope and profundity, is wide enough and voluminous enough to encompass both the complexity of actuality and the innovation of artistic forms. At the same time, it is sufficiently well-defined to establish a flexible but clear-cut boundary line between realism (no matter how innovative it may be) and the modernistic lifelessness of art, with its destruction of artistic forms."

This topic is hardly new. Use was made of the slogan of a ruthless struggle against modernism when Akhmatova, Zoshchenko, Eisenstein, Prokofiev, Shostakovich, Miaslovsky, as well as dozens of very important artists, beginning with Favorskiy, Deynika, and Matveyev, were excommunicated from Soviet art. At a conference of cultural figures held in the VKP(b) Central Committee in connection with the 1948 decree on formalism in music, A. Zhdanov stated the following: "Soviet art is developing in a struggle against the manifestations and regurgitations of formalism. The epigones of the West's rotten formalistic art are still poisoning the pure air of Soviet art with their venom. It is utterly inadmissible that, along with the art of socialist realism, we still have trends which consider the French formalists Picasso and Matisse, and the Cubists as their teachers...." And he went on to point out: "Unfortunately, many of our art scholars and artists have not yet evaluated the harm which could be inflicted upon Soviet art by a lack of a well-defined demarcation between artists who stand up for socialist realism and the formalists."

The 1948 decree asserted that the creative works of Shostakovich and Prokofiev "present formalistic distortions with particular vividness," whereas in V. Vanslov's article he speaks about the "realistic essence" of the creative works by Prokofiev and Shostakovich, "who were mistakenly 'excommunicated' from realism." Nevertheless, the old idea of demarcation still remains in force, and the justifications also remain unchanged. Realism is presented not as a style which can co-exist on an equal footing with other trends, but as a "feature of the very nature of art"; "it enables art to truthfully depict life in artistic images." And socialist realism is declared to be a feature of the nature of a socialist society. Accordingly, the implication is that non-realistic art is not truthful, nor can it be socialistic.

To whom does V. Vanslov propose to entrust the task of "drawing the boundary lines" (no matter how flexible they may be)? What guarantees are there that, in the demarcation process, those who are relegated to the

category of "modernists...draining the lifeblood out of art" will not again be mistakenly "excommunicated" from realism? Will they have stakes driven through them in accordance with the following directions from 1948: "We must completely root out all elements of formalism, which are alien to Soviet ideology."? Or will they have some sort of reservation created for them? V. Vanslov's article is not too clear on these points. It is obvious that we need not be overly nice about this; after all, in V. Vanslov's opinion, "depiction in painting cannot be arbitrary, nor can it be non-objective." But once this "cannot" is admitted, nothing will again hinder—for the umpteenth time—"banning" Kandinsky, Malevich, Chagall....

Why was it necessary in our own times to resurrect the Zhdanovian principles of demarcation, which would seem to have been condemned by history long ago? And why was it necessary to frighten people with the menace of modernism, or to hurl oneself into the defense of realism, which is in no need of any specific protection? In order to answer these questions, we must give some thought as to what kind of realism we are talking about, and what kind of menace hung over it.

V. Vanslov employs the term "realism" as well as "socialist realism" outside of any sort of historical context, outside of development, outside of actual former schools of art—as something not subject to any kind of external influences, as something unitary, constant, and ideal. "Vulgarizers can compromise all that they want," he writes, "and socialist realism is not responsible for this. Such instances have expressed not its essence, but rather its distortion. In essence, however, this concept embodies in itself everything that is best in our art." How wonderful to think that our art in certain periods of its history was considered the best! How does it pertain, let's say, for example, to the assertion by the journal *ISKUSSTVO* (No 6, 1948) that "the Soviet people highly value the authors of works which recreate the images of great leaders."? Or to the statement that at postwar exhibitions it was possible to encounter works which were not on a high enough professional level, works bearing in themselves vestiges of formalism, naturalism, primitivism, and excessive stylization, works which were anti-artistic and like handicrafts. As examples, one could cite many pictures by masters such as S. Gerasimov and M. Saryan.... As we can see, 40 years ago the idea of what was "best" differed markedly from our present-day evaluations. Accordingly, the understanding of realism was also somewhat different; not only were S. Gerasimov and M. Saryan "excommunicated" from it, but it encompassed, in the first place, "works recreating the images of great leaders," and, to be more precise, the Leader.... No, we cannot avoid taking a historical approach to the problem of realism, and inasmuch as V. Vanslov is not an historian of the fine arts, we will have to do this for him.

Let's begin with the fact that the term "realism" was certainly not born simultaneously with the origin of art, as might be concluded from the article entitled "On the

Breadth of Realism and Its 'Banks'." The concept of "realism" in painting began to appear only in the middle of the 19th century. It was the term used by the French artist Gustave Courbet as the title of his 1855 show. And it was then that the principles of realism were formulated, specifically as a style possessing very definite artistic criteria. Realism was the name given to a trend of art at that time which depicted scenes from the everyday lives and customs of people belonging to various social classes in the form of a literal verisimilitude tending toward naturalism.

It was only later that expanded ideas arose about realism as a profound pictorial truth, inherent in all great art, whether that of the Renaissance, Classical Antiquity, or Ancient Egypt. However, together with this expanded idea, the purely stylistic understanding of the term also continued to exist. Thus, the artists of the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia group straightforwardly declared their adherence to realism as a description of everyday life (the group's initial name was the "Association of Artists for Studying Contemporary Revolutionary Everyday Life").

The unequivocal, more widespread, and more frequent use of a certain term is not a rarity in art criticism. Usually it has no consequences other than purely scholarly disputes. But in the case of "realism" matters turned out differently. From the late 1920's on, a tendency to merge both interpretations began to manifest itself more and more definitely, replacing the concept of the profound truth of art with an external, purely formal verisimilitude. A school of thought emerged which claimed that the genuine truth of life was inherent solely in a lifelike depiction of everyday existence. It maintained that literal verisimilitude contains within itself, as it were, *ab initio* imagistic truth, and that any departure from such verisimilitude constitutes thereby a departure both from truth and from realism.

It was also at that time that boundary limits began to be established; demarcations of and excommunications from realism began to be conducted, assuming an increasingly harsh, intolerant form, right up to direct political repressions.

But why did seemingly purely professional artistic questions take on such a political coloration? The answer lay in the particular political functional role which had been preplanned for art to play during the years when Stalin was consolidating his power. Art had to actively participate in creating a historical mythology, to construct that picture of our society's life and that portrait of the Leader which Stalin needed to introduce into people's consciousness. Art was assigned the task of replacing or hiding undesirable reality. It had to correct history, report on meetings which never had taken place, friendships which had never existed, and heroic deeds which had never been performed. It had to celebrate the image

of the Great Leader as wise, splendid, filled with kindness and concern for his people, as well as a picture of the abundant, happy life of the rejoicing, much-favored people.

The fine arts, and particularly genre painting with its visual concreteness, almost photographic fidelity, and seeming objectivity, occupied a special place in the cause of myth creation. Portrait likeness, verisimilitude in conveying uniforms, or ders, medals, badges, details of the surroundings—whatever else could so convince a simple, untutored person of the genuineness of everything that was depicted on the canvas, instill belief in the fact that throughout all of Lenin's revolutionary activity he did not take any step without his great comrade-in-arms; that Molotov, carrying a child on his shoulder—that same Molotov who demanded that the wives of "the enemies of the people" be shot—was the embodiment of charity and clemency; that at an "unforgettable meeting" Krupskaya, beaming with joy, awarded Stalin her ecstatic applause....

Here verisimilitude was not simply desirable; it was an integral part of the political program. The more natural were the details reproduced, the more reliable would seem the programmed lie of the entire picture hidden behind them.

But in order to successfully carry out the assigned task, it was necessary to imbue the people with the idea that "Stalinist socialist realism," as the critics obsequiously termed it—but which in its essence was a pseudosocialist pseudorealism—was indeed the true realism, the apex not only of Soviet art, but of all world art. And the genuinely true realism, already dangerous just because of its truthfulness, which talked about not absurdities, but about real, not mythologized life, was proclaimed to be formalism, impressionism, or whatever, merely to afford a pretext to besmirch it and clear it off the road.

The period of the "Thaw" restored many artistic reputations, made a tangible breach in the stronghold of pseudorealism, and then stopped half-way along the road. The experience of "myth creation" very soon became suitable to new cult adherents; "negative phenomena" (as they were modestly called) required new touching up.

Our art is far from having gotten rid of pseudorealism. And why, then, does V. Vanslov, in demanding that boundary limits be established for realism, so to speak, "from the left," not talk about the need to demarcate realism from pseudorealism by setting boundary limits "from the right"? In frightening us with the threat of "blood draining" and "destruction," in demanding that artists "stand up against subjectivism and modernism, which are hostile to truth," why does he modestly refrain from talking about a threat which is much more serious from an art which is not only genuinely hostile to truth, but which has made lying its own principle? And if we are going to speak about realism as "the capacity to

depict life truthfully," then the first thing to be done in our own times is to draw precise boundary lines between truth and lying, to talk openly about that unseemly and at times criminal role which was played during the years of the Stalin cult, as well as during the period of "stagnation," by pseudorealism, officious and crowned with awards. It did more than anyone to "drain the blood" of and "destroy" Soviet art.

Genuine realism has never been afraid of even the most eccentric experiments; in the final analysis, it has only been enriched by such experiments. Nor does it consider itself to be "threatened" by the existence of many trends—including even cubism, suprematism, expressionism, and the like; it does not fear creative disputes nor the most furious struggle. But all of this is feared like fire by pseudorealism, which is capable of existing only by creating a "dead zone" around itself, by dealing very harshly with "enemies"—real and imaginary—, by annihilating them politically and, if possible, even physically. Soviet art and Soviet art criticism have fully experienced this themselves.

Evidently, it is difficult for some people to forego the principles of past years not only in public life, but also in artistic life.

2384

Writer Accuses Soviet Journals of 'Political Striptease'

18000367 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
1 Apr 88 pp 2-3

[Article by the A. Fadeyev prize winner, Kharkov's writer Vladimir Petrov: "Soviet People Have Their Own Pride"]

[Text] This catchy Mayakovskiy's line suddenly came to my mind during the recent Moscow-London TV bridge discussions. I was left with the impression that one representative "team" looked weaker than the self-assured gentlemen from London, especially those in the front rows. At the direct question: "What are the achievements of your system that you are proud of?", our side responded in an unsure and rather incomprehensible manner about the lack of unemployment and the easiness of finding a job. And this was all.

True, later on one good-looking girl added something about our achievement in strengthening friendship among peoples. However, she did it with an obvious confusion (probably, she remembered the events in Nagornyy Karabakh).

Yes, all of us were kind of lost. . .

And it is true not only for the TV bridge. The TV bridge was only a confirmation, a particular case indicating a much wider phenomenon. The phenomenon could be

called an "erosion of the feeling of social pride". Go through the press in recently published newspapers and magazines, and you will find a concrete confirmation of this phenomenon.

Why is it so? From where and why did this wave of excessive "modesty" self-humiliation, and even shyness appear among us?

There are reasons for that because nothing happens without a reason. One of the young people (student of a technical college) answered me straight without beating around the bush. "And what is there to be proud of? Socialism as a system has discredited itself in the eyes of Youth. Read magazines and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and you will understand everything."

I have to admit that such a categorical and straightforward statement (it is fashionable today) did not surprise me at all, because I subscribe and carefully read the magazines and newspapers he had in mind. Indeed, what should the poor student do, if in the authoritative NOVYY MIR he reads long articles about a mistakenly built Socialism (not the one which V.I. Lenin had in mind), anti-popular essence of the administrative system, and even about the "counter-revolutionary coup" made by Stalin in the late 20's (and what did we do after that? Realized the program of the putsch, is it not so?).

I anticipate angry responses: "It is a distortion! It was told for the sake of discussion. One should correctly understand democracy and glasnost!"

It is exactly what I want to discuss: How, in my opinion, one should understand democracy and glasnost.

Let us begin with the fact that a discussion necessarily means an exchange of opinions. And those exchanging opinions must have equal rights. However, please have mercy, what is taking place on the pages of some popular publications reminds me of a game played with one goal. They thrash and strip into fibers the poor Socialism reaching the limits of possible and even impossible, and all this is being done under the slogan of glasnost. So, let it be so! Publish also the opposite opinions and fundamental and bright articles in defense of Socialism (rather than short excerpts in the form of letters-responses, as NOVYY MIR and OGONEK do it so "democratically").

Maybe, the scientific socialism as the main revolutionary idea of the 20th century is so strong and obvious that it does not need any defense today. I do not think so. Today, different journalistic, archcritical, and fiction publications of our Soviet authors, many of whom with quite honest and noble intentions are busy with "cleaning the Aegean stables" of recent history, were added to (and added to the negative influence of, one should not hide this fact) the multi-volume "Everests" of publications by apologists of bourgeoisie bringing down socialism and to the flows of universal anti-Soviet dirt

being poured by the reactionary foreign press and corrupt radiovoices. Meanwhile, we should not hide this fact also, others zealously exercise in a "political striptease".

Just recently we loudly spoke (and it is stressed at the 27th CPSU Congress) about the offensive character of our ideology. Today, we have a clear recession, reduction in strength, and, in some places, a surrender of positions. What is happening to our forged ideological fighters? Or, maybe, they "do not keep the powder dry" and cannot find persuasive argument in defence of socialism. Life and the current events are the best proof of the positive process. So show then, lift brightly above the routine everyday activities, and reveal their unquestionable attractiveness.

An instructive fact: the edge of ideological struggle lately has clearly shifted into the area of Soviet history. It is logical and justified. We must know the historical truth in its full extent and know the lessons of history in order to move successfully forward while solving the revolutionary tasks of perestroika. Readers' interest is attracted exactly to this, and legions of writers (unfortunately, in most cases not the professional historian, but rather fiction writers) rushed to the historical records.

It goes without saying that history (historical truth) consists of facts. And in our days of general glasnost and objectivity the truth of a fact must be the starting point of any excursion into history. That is, we are talking about scientific honesty of a journalist, or a writer, in all cases when he discusses a historical theme.

It is especially strange, when those authors, who themselves actively fight for the objective rendering of history, distort the facts.

In this sense, the polemics on PRAVDA's pages about M. Shatrov's play "Further, Further, Further" is very characteristic. It seems that everything is fully obvious: the playwright in a series of cases unjustifiably distorted the historical truth and was advised of that. But what do you say! The revered men of culture defending the play had completely shifted the stresses by considering the justified claims to be a "prohibitive" tendency. And this is an antidemocratic attitude. And this is distortion.

It was enough said and written about a whole list of historical inaccuracies and distortions in A. Rybakov's novel "Children of Arbat". I would like to stress only that, as a rule, after these inaccuracies, in a series of places, rather doubtful if not wrong assessments of the author naturally follow.

And A. Nuykin's conclusion in his article "Ideals or Interests?" (NOVYY MIR, No 1, 1988) about I. Stalin's "counter-revolutionary coup" appears to be completely paradoxical. I am asking you to understand me correctly: in no way am I trying to whitewash Stalin with his grim monstrosity and dictator's habits in the style of worst

Oriental despots. However, what has it to do with a "counter-revolutionary coup"? Does not A. Nuykin understand that in his heated dislike of Stalin he projects a shadow on the whole Party and its policy then and after? Does not Nuykin know that delegates of two Party Congresses, namely, the 13th and 15th, were familiarized with the text of "Lenin's Will"? And that Stalin twice at the Central Committee Plenums asked to resign from the position of the General Secretary. His request was rejected twice. In such a case, what kind of a coup are we talking about? It is another case showing that Stalin had many supporters in the Party and among the delegates of congresses, but this fact requires a special analysis.

A question comes to one's mind: Why does Nuykin have to bring up a doubtful and even wrong thesis about a "counter-revolutionary coup"? Did he do it for the sake of a witty statement or for reasons of another kind? In any case, this thesis is already being used by those who have Socialism stuck in their throat and who constantly see the "evil empire".

Whatever is said about mistakes, inaccuracies, and distortions, in the final count, presentation of one or another historical situation depends directly on the author's position (I make this statement as a professional writer). I have in mind the interpretation of facts. Here is a fresh, completely concrete example: Recent publications about the Kronstadt riot of 1921 in NOVYY MIR, No 9, 1987, (M. Kurayev's story "Captain Dikshstein") and YUNOST, No 10, 1987 (Ye. Drabkina, "1921").

If Ye. Drabkina, a participant in these events, writes about the actions of the 7th army under the command of Tukhachevskiy as a massive heroic event, namely an assault of a sea fortress across open thin ice in March, M. Kurayev describes it in dark colors depicting the assault as an unnecessary, bloody adventure (in spite of the fact that V.I. Lenin said at the 10th Congress: "Kronstadt for us today is more dangerous than Kolchak and Denikin put together").

As we can see, the historical fact is the same, but there are two different interpretations, two positions. Why is it so? It seems that because the authors have different goals.

I would like to stress one more time: Since we have such a vested interest in history, let us treat it carefully and, what is more important, honestly. It deserves all the respect and does not need to be either decorated and made up, or to be stained with soot.

By the way, let us stress this true statement that our heroic history is exactly the A-letter, where the pride of a Soviet man starts. Yes, history is our pride and our great possession since Lenin stood at its beginnings, and the heroic and long-suffering Soviet peoples were doing it, rather than personalities regardless of whether they were

light or dark. It encompassed everything: from Red cavalry attacks, Magnitka, Dneproges, and Turksib to the "fateful 40's" of the Great Patriotic War, first sputnik, thermonuclear Tokomak, and orbital space stations. Let us never forget that. Let our youth also know without thinking much and doubting: they indeed have something to be proud of.

Socialism is as strong as before, and the future belongs to it. There is no doubt about it.

Today we have in front of us difficult tasks and problems. Perestroyka is a process of a great renewal and purification, which is often painful, contradictory, and connected with definite losses. And, those who started to grumble already and cry in their shirt, let them remember that 2 years ago at the 27th Congress, the Party warned that it will be difficult. The response was a total approval. One should not forget this fact as well as that in the final count, one common great goal is uniting us and calls through the cyclones of international complications, painful interior obstacles, and simply everyday life problems.

We are proud that we are the first to walk the right road. Socialism does not have an alternative. Today even bourgeois sociologists recognize it. And, as strange as it may be, they are not guided by Marxism. They use the notorious philosophy of pragmatism, which in our overpopulated, ecologically and by nuclear weapons endangered world has to raise a principle: Share, if you want to survive. Of course, we reject the idea of a primitive egalitarianism, and at the same time we realize that the really scientific socialism is winning by the power of example. We will have a tremendous work to do and colossal efforts to apply along this road toward a nuclear-free world of equality and social justice.

13355

Introduction to Orwell's '1984' Given by Zalygin, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA

18000366 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 May 88 p 15

[Introduction by staff writer: "About George Orwell and His Novel"; introduction by the editor-in-chief of NOVYY MIR, S.P. Zalygin]

[Text] Of all old tales concerning foreign literature, this one was one of the most stable and impenetrable. During the customs checks George Orwell's novel "1984" was unconditionally removed as "disallowed to bring in". As to libraries, in those largest ones where it could find its way, it was placed on the most distant shelf and was issued, naturally, only in exceptional cases by special permission.

One does not need to guess why this taboo had originated. The novel was finished in 1948 and published in 1949. And already on the first pages, as in the excerpt

being offered, the reader would find an image of a "man with a mustache" looking at people from "any conspicuous angle". The momentary panic recognition was enough to announce the book which was being read by the rest of the world, a NONBOOK.

Some 15 years ago the ban was modified. One could make references to Orwell and it was even fashionable, especially if for security one would attach to his name a fancy tag, something like "herald of the cold war". With all their irrespectability, these tricks were, it seems, more acceptable than the dead silence: readers soon learned the rules of the game and became proficient in obtaining information bypassing the tags. As to the proposals to translate the novel, and we know for sure that such were made, these proposals were rejected without discussion, as before.

And for what reason? If the novel would be translated long ago, readers would learn long ago that Orwell did not intend to arouse political differences or to slander socialism, which was the most commonly used accusation. Even more, before his death, which was soon to come, he persistently argued with those interpreters who hurried to find in the novel such things that were not there at all. Alas, in the cacophony of the cold war the weakening voice of the author was simply ignored. Year after year, myths and commentary to myths were attributed to the novel, like it would enter a system of distorting mirrors, where each next image is uglier than the previous one. And if we are not afraid to call things their names, we have to admit that our long unobjective attitude toward Orwell, bans, and tags, only helped to create the mentioned situation.

Time has come to get rid of stagnated bans on small and large issues, to throw away myths, and to break the distorting mirrors. And, in particular, to re-read George Orwell thoughtfully and without prejudice.

Yes, the nightmarish society of "1984" is using ideology called Engsoc (English socialism) by the author. But let us not forget which ideology called itself national-socialist. Orwell fought fascism in Spain and was severely wounded. When he was not able to fight in a hand-to-hand combat anymore, he fought using pen and word. He asked a simple question: Will fascism not find a nutritious soil at the shores of Albion? If so, how soon might it happen? How will it look and what shape will it have?

The idea of the novel appeared this way. However, Orwell went further: he understood that the "brown plague" as Europe learned it in the 30's and 40's represented a terrible in size but still only a particular case. "1984" is a burning satire on a totalitarian society of any origin and an angry reproof of anti-humanism regardless of its disguise.

It is sad, very sad, that certain pages of the novel may without any difficulty be addressed to us, but we should not blame Orwell for that.

One clarification is necessary: he did not aim at anyone in particular, he did not copy, but rather guessed and foresaw; and the shock of his direct hits have without exaggeration an international character. For example, in his invented comrade Ogilvie, he foresaw the standard hero of the "cultural revolution" Ley Fan, the "corrosion-resistant small bolt of chairman Mao". "Two-minute meetings" and "weeks of hate" remind us of the notorious "Islamic guards". The total surveillance using the modern electronic devices became a reality exactly in the "advanced" countries of the West and, first of all, across the ocean. As to Orwell's compatriots, the British, they saw in the novel then and see now so many details of their national life and features dear to their heart that on the eve of 1984, a certain anxiety was felt in Britain: What if the "prophecy" in some mystical way will become a reality?

There is no need to re-tell the novel, but it is worth adding that its end is tragic and seems to be hopeless, but it is not exactly so. Orwell does not prophesy and rejoice, but warns. He does not lose faith that there is an alternate solution to the "1984" society, and it will be presented exactly by socialism if it will make a strong union with democracy and respect for a person.

As to the hero of the book, Winston Smith, who rebelled against totalitarian regime and against ministries of rights and love, wrote in his diary:

To the future or the past, to the time, when the thought is free, when people differ one from another and are not lonely; to the time, where the truth is the truth and the past is not transformed into nonexistence; from the epoch of similar and lonely, from the epoch of the Big Brother, from the epoch of hypocrisy, Welcome!

The following are the thoughts of S.P. Zalygin: I always thought that social fiction is one of the most serious, if not the most serious, genres.

It is capable of discussing the future in such a way that no documentaries and science fiction can do unless the same social element is present in those works at the same qualitative and quantitative level.

Actually, the same is true in reality: any science is developing in this or that concrete social conditions and is depending on these conditions.

I also think that when one discusses social fiction, he must mention George Orwell, its classic and Master. I think he is somehow close to our Bulgakov and, maybe, even to Platonov, and to Zamyatin with his "We", too. Of course, those are different artistic styles, but one cannot miss the similarity in the directions of thought and concerns for the destiny of mankind.

Now in 1988, one cannot overlook that we passed 1984 at not such a great distance from its model long ago created by Orwell's fantasy; and even earlier to some extent by Bulgakov's premonitions; and fragile, and at the same time strong in its pain and artistic feeling of the author of "Foundation Pit" and "Chevengur".

And if these equally realistic and phantasmagoric figures B and C clearly appear in front of our reader, one cannot leave him without the A-figure, namely, George Orwell, who, it seems, like nobody else represented his genre in clarity of genre's laws, rules, and his own ironic, intelligent, and bold logic.

It is possible that Orwell directed his pamphlet to a concrete address, namely that of socialism. However, those times, when it would scare or, mildly speaking, embarrass us, are finally gone.

In addition, we possess now a much larger historic (and also practical) experience than that of Orwell. Today, he cannot be our judge anymore, but we can be his judges, because we know where he was right and where he was wrong, and what he had written and what he had not accomplished and thought out.

We know about ourselves that after we had made the socialist revolution and the first, also revolutionary, changes, we imagined that by their virtue we determined our future, which, of course, was the most-most bright.

We know that because of these bright notions the dark shadows of reality often appear.

We know that a dictatorship may be accompanied not only by brutal and inexorable activity, but also by a feeble inactivity. Today, we know this phenomenon in all its extent.

We also cannot be deceived by dictatorship of certain democracies, which provide their citizen with wide political rights and deprive them of social rights: enjoy politics even when you do not have a roof over your head, work, and daily bread; criticize your government but do not dare to offend your direct boss by asking him for a part of the profit you are bringing him.

We know that the brutal dictatorships of Chile and Paraguay, and those of racists in the Middle East and South Africa do not have closer friends and patrons than the same self-glorified democracies.

We know that exactly this patronage during the times past had supported and supports today the origin and formation of fascism.

We came to this knowledge using our own experience and mind; nobody had ever helped us; we never had teachers and especially not protectors, because the History did not prepare them for us and, alas, will never prepare.

Therefore, we must tirelessly search for food for our critical and, as it follows, optimistic mind everywhere: in science, politics, history, and the arts.

Why am I discussing all of this? This is required by social fiction: It is international and requires an application of a political aspect to the view on the world. Because of that, NOVYY MIR will publish "1984".

NOTE: We decided that it is necessary to prepare a new and, as we think, highly qualified translation of the novel, which is realized for us by Viktor Petrovich Golyshev.

13355

Decline in Use of Ukrainian Language Examined
18000306a Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
16 Mar 88 p 1

[Article by S. Yermolenko, doctor of philosophical sciences and director of the department of language and culture at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Linguistics: "A living Wellspring of Unity...Like the Air We Breathe"]

[Excerpts] The content of one's native language, the study of it, and the use of it in daily discourse and in art as well as in official texts are matters of current concern to many readers. Articles that we have published on this subject, including "Remember Your Name" and "Don't Impoverish Yourself" last year, followed by "With Faith in the Power of Speech" and "Let's Be Frank" (by the Donetsk writer V. Shutov) have elicited quite a number of letters in response. Some of them we have published in the newspaper, although we have not, of course, been able to use all of them. The people have expressed a variety of opinions, often taking extreme positions. We have therefore requested Svetlana Yakovlena Yermolenko, doctor of philological sciences, to comment on the letters received by the editorial staff.

In publishing these materials, the editors of *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* continue to follow a consistent line in support of the free and effective exposition and earnest discussion of matters pertaining to the cultural and spiritual life of society, within the framework of the revolutionary transformation of the present way of life, and in the interest of sharing with our readers the search for ways of resolving the difficult problems that have been accumulating in this sphere throughout the decades. The problem of language is among them. The most important criteria in this regard are the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of socialism, and the well-rounded development of national cultures—including the enrichment of Ukrainian culture—with the experience and priceless spiritual treasures of mankind.

In the novel "Career" by Vasil Bykov this incident occurs. During the hard time of the Fascist occupation, two people meet on Belorussian territory: a young fellow

in the military who has left his village, having lost the habit of speaking his native Belorussian language (although one could always tell that he was Belorussian by his accent speaking Russian); and a young woman who has grown up in the city in Russian-speaking surroundings, but who, ever since her childhood, has assimilated the language of her grandmother, and who, thanks to her father, a student of folklore, has come to admire the art and living language of the people. It is she who reveals to the fellow the beauty and charm of his native tongue. It is clearly no accident that the writer has chosen a critical moment in the lives of the people when they are examining for themselves the highest spiritual values—love for one's native land and the people's cultural heritage.

Human culture is conditioned by the environment, the circumstances of life, and its traditions, which include the linguistic tradition as it continues to develop within the society. Today we speak a good deal about language as a form of expressing national culture as well as a medium of communist education and personal self-criticism. Under conditions of restructuring, our country needs people with initiative and creativity, possessing professional skills in combination with a high level of culture. Moreover, it is necessarily a culture of international relations with a knowledge of the history of the region in which one was born and raised, together with a correct understanding of linguistic issues in the multinational state.

It is for this reason that the authors of the letters to the editors consider the linguistic situation in the republic primarily within the larger cultural context.

On the subject of language and culture, the degree of concern of A. Savelyev is wholly understandable. "Is it really normal," he writes, "when many residents of Kharkov have not only not read the works of their fellow townsman, G. Kvitki-Osnovyanenko, but have not even heard of such a writer?"

It is no secret that in the mass culture there is greater interest in the works of Druon and Dumas than in the art of T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, or Lesya Ukrainka. Incidentally, A. Savelyev is justified in considering I. Franko's "The Crossing of Paths" comparable to the most prestigious books of the present day. It is not enough to know that there is such a work by I. Franko or that there are some very interesting plays by Lesya Ukrainka; it is also of importance to get the pleasure that comes from reading such classics.

Undoubtedly, there is a close connection between the fact that in Cherkassy native writers are little known and not always accorded respect and the fact that it is not easy to find in the city a Ukrainian school or a Ukrainian kindergarten. As A. Klimenk writes: "The parents turn the children over to the nearest kindergarten or school, because it is easier, rather than carry them all the way across town." Readers of the newspaper have also called

attention to the changeover of billboards from Ukrainian to Russian. Letters on this subject have come from comrades Boyko (Zhdanov), Stepanchenko (Odessa), and workers of the Selmash Plant at Belaya Tserkov. It is not for the first time that an issue is made of the absence of postcards for sale with headings in Ukrainian (by R. Marusyak of Lvov). It is precisely facts such as these that give rise to the conception that "the cultural needs of the native population of the republic are not being fully satisfied."

It is 15 years since one could hear people speaking in Ukrainian, writes comrade Stepanchenko of Odessa, and now even the signs in Ukrainian are slowly changing. A completely opposed viewpoint is expressed in a letter from Donetsk: "There is no point in artificially propagating the Ukrainian language in the Donbass." There are Ukrainian newspapers and books in the kiosks and bookstores reportedly, but no demand for them.

It is difficult to "lay the blame" on those who behave in such a way in educated circles, although one need not condone such manifestations of petty bourgeois attitudes.

Often one has occasion to hear the phrase "satisfying the cultural needs of the population." But let us agree. Needs must not only be satisfied; they must be engendered, and they must be cultivated. But how are they to be cultivated? Interest is lost in reading Ukrainian books. Mothers do not buy their children publications with brightly colored illustrations because these, they say, are Ukrainian books. This means that they themselves feel no need to be closely acquainted with their native tongue or national literary art.

Conducted tours are an important means of increasing interest in culture. Who is engaged in this work? Is there, for example, a literary tour in Kiev devoted to Ukrainian literary classics? Do the residents of Kiev know about the stay of T. Shevchenko in Kiev? Are there special lectures in the particular field of Ukrainian literature?

Petty bourgeois "culture" is a rampant phenomenon. It has not even occurred to the local inhabitants that Lev Tolstoy studied Ukrainian in order to read T. G. Shevchenko in the original. I might mention, too, the well-known academic rule that one likes the subject that one knows well and understands. Unfortunately, many city children do not know and do not love the Ukrainian language and literature. Why is this? Is it not because by no means every teacher loves and respects the language?

"Why is it that the native language has become superfluous in the home?" Thus the issue is put forward by comrade Korobka (Kharkov) in a letter commenting on the article "Let's Be Frank" by V. Shutov. All of the letter-writers, in fact, make an effort to explain the processes occurring in our multi-national country in

terms of population diffusion, the spread of international marriages, and the peculiarities of national population profiles in the various republics.

Take, as an example, this letter from Ye. Donichenko (Donetsk). A quarter of the million residents of Donetsk consider Ukrainian their native language—"They consider it to be, but they don't use it every day," comments the author. He attributes this particularly to the fact that the person who speaks in Russian wants to seem "better educated."

Deserving of attention is the contention that an appropriate organ of the UkSSR Council of Ministers should concern itself with the affairs of the national minorities living in the Ukraine—the Bulgars, Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Gagauz, and others. The idea is incorrect that "Only Ukrainian should be spoken in the Ukraine" (stated by A. Klimenko); for the interests of national minorities living in the Ukraine must be taken into consideration.

Nevertheless, how is the decline in prestige of the Ukrainian language to be explained? A number of perceptive responses to this question are contained in the letters. There is no place to make use of a knowledge of Ukrainian. It is not needed as a rule in the VUZ, in daily affairs, or in the work place. The Ukrainian language does not have the place it should even in cultural life.

Once I happened to be watching a television program broadcast from Lvov. The discussion was about a teacher of Russian language and literature in a rural school. She had organized with love an evening featuring the poetry of S. Yesenin, and she skillfully conducted the children's language practice, in support of which a poster read: "On Wednesdays we speak in Russian." That is to say, this closely related language was to be absorbed not only in lines of poetry but in daily practice. Meanwhile, I have not since heard of similar methods of work on the part of teachers of Ukrainian language and literature either on the radio or on television. There are not enough such educational broadcasts, not enough inspiring teachers, and not enough people trained to give interesting public lectures.

There is one other serious misfortune. The continuity of family tradition in using the language has been broken. Each one of us, of course, can recall instances when parents converse together in one language and with their children in another language. I will not try to evaluate this phenomenon with respect to its influence on the psychological development of the child, or in terms of the child's creative self-expression, to say nothing of the atmosphere of trust that is formed between parents and children. But I know full well that if a mother does not sing lullabies to her child in her native language, that child will be deprived growing up.

Should we study or not study the native language? This is perhaps the most controversial question of all. Comrade Boyko, a labor veteran and steel worker from Zhdanov, believes that "the study of Ukrainian by those who live exclusively in the Ukraine ought to be mandatory." M. Zaretskaya from Berdichev writes: "Only those who are temporarily living in another locality should be excused from the study of the republic national language. A knowledge of languages enriches a person, broadens one's horizon, and makes it possible to acquire the wealth of one's cultural heritage." R. Guliyshuk (Kalush in Ivano-Frankovsk) states categorically: "If you are Ukrainian, you must go to a Ukrainian school or preschool institution." And T. Korobka expresses surprise at the very question of whether to study or not study one's native language. "It is, of course, just as natural as for a Frenchman to study French or a Swede to study Swedish."

On the other hand, an altogether different opinion is expressed by comrade Kukhtin of Gorlovka, Donetsk Oblast. The writer calls it a tragedy when children are subjected to the Ukrainian language (not to mention mathematics or a foreign language) when they know neither Russian nor Ukrainian, and says it is because of this—note how easily he explains everything—that teenagers encounter scholastic difficulties. In the opinion of the writer "it is necessary to carry out study programs in Russian and Ukrainian in accordance with the wishes of the parents, who know better than the teachers the capabilities of their children." Comrade Bronskiy, a pensioner from Kiev, is of the same opinion: "In the republic's Russian schools instruction in Ukrainian can only be on a voluntary basis. Let the Russian language in Ukrainian and Georgian schools be non-compulsory likewise. Those who do not want to study do not have to study—I am sure that there will be very few of them." Actually, parents are rarely to be found who do not want their children to master Russian, which is the language of international discourse, the use of which makes it possible to understand people in every corner of this enormous country. Yet this same writer believes that the language of any union republic overburdens the student for five or six years, and in the case of one preparing for military school, for example, is not necessary. To require that the language of a republic be studied in school, in the writer's opinion, is "narrow nationalism" (as if there could be such a thing as broad nationalism). It turns out that it is quite simple to resolve this issue: If a youth is preparing to work in agriculture or to become a teacher, let him study the republic language diligently. But if not, why study it?

In the psychological climate of the present day, actually, a very pragmatic, "businesslike" attitude permeates the atmosphere of spiritual life.

Twenty years ago and more, study in a Ukrainian school did not deter a young fellow from the Ukraine from entering military school and performing excellently there. Nowadays, it turns out, a native language can

prevent one from becoming an educated and cultured officer in the Soviet Army. This conclusion may be drawn from a number of letters.

And it is true undoubtedly in other respects. Again I want to stress the fact that the teaching of Ukrainian is very poor in our republic. There are not enough qualified teachers or good textbooks and supplies. The proper usage of both Russian and Ukrainian is not at the level it should be. Educated speech is not heard at the theaters or on the radio or television. Teachers emerge from our higher and mid-level teaching institutions, where the basics of what they have learned in childhood should be polished and developed, and it turns out that the opposite is taking place—that the fundamentals acquired within the family and during childhood are being destroyed and disappearing. Thus we are convinced that the content of language is taught primarily by one's surroundings. It depends, too, on the cultural attainments of each one of us.

When heated discussions arise regarding the linguistic situation in the Ukraine, one often has occasion to hear that as things have turned out, it is necessary to take into consideration the actual circumstances. But, of course, no situation comes about of its own accord; it depends on specific people, acting under specific conditions, and not in terms of generalities but rather specific and systematic activity.

For example, in the posters inviting people to the Philharmonic Society concerts, rarely is the headline in Ukrainian. As the management of this institution explains, the posters in Russian were prepared in advance for the entire season. But the question arises, why may not such posters be printed for an entire season in Ukrainian?

A letter from I. Kolodochka correctly poses the issue of achieving a proper balance in the function of the two languages, Russian and Ukrainian, and regarding the ideal bilingualism that can be achieved, taking into consideration the entire context of national linguistic problems, from kindergartens and elementary schools on up to higher educational and technical schools.

The resolution by the Ukrainian CP Central Committee on patriotic and international education noted that the area for the use of the Ukrainian language in the republic has been narrowing. To explain the causal factors for this process is easier than to predict the consequences. It is therefore only natural for the party to focus attention on national issues within the context of cultivating a knowledge of international relations. However, although a good deal of time has elapsed since August 1987, the restructuring process among us with respect to education and culture has been insufficiently realized.

It is quite impossible to instill patriotic and international sentiments without a consciousness of national worth. And there is no inherent contradiction in this. Love for one's native language is in no way an obstacle to loving Russian and acquiring a mastery of the language of international relations.

A consciousness of language and the cultural content of language is formed not only by the family, the school, and the immediate environment. The mass information media under current conditions play almost the most important role of all. A powerful and truly immense influence on the linguistic education of the society is exerted through radio and television, through newspapers and journals.

When there is enough air to breathe, we never complain, "How much air there is!" But when there is not enough air, invariably we will say: "There is too little air in here!" So I resort to this metaphor: We do not even notice our native language while it continues to go on all around us, naturally. It is like the air we breathe.

12889

**BSSR CP CC Notes Measures To Intensify
Language Study in Republic Schools**
18000306b Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in
Russian 24 Mar 88 p 4

[BELTA report: "Fostering Patriots"]

[Text] The Belorussian CP Central Committee had a conference with senior workers of the BSSR Ministry of Education and representatives of the republic Writers Union, under the chairmanship of V. A. Pechennikov, Belorussian CP Central Committee secretary. The conference reviewed the activities of national education organs and republic writers' organizations with regard to fostering patriotic and international education among the population, propaganda efforts towards the bilingual development of Russian and the national language, and improving the teaching of Belorussian language and literature in general education schools.

Reports on this subject were given by L. K. Sukhnat, BSSR minister of education, and N. S. Gilevich, first secretary of the BSSR Writers Union Board. Other participants in the work of the conference included V. V. Zuyenok and A. A. Zhuk, BSSR Writers Union secretaries; G. P. Pashkov, secretary of the BSSR party organization; B. I. Sachenko, chairman of the republic Writers Union's Commission for Teaching Belorussian Language and Literature; and B. A. Gapanovich and V. N. Shkurko, administration heads of the BSSR Ministry of Education.

It was noted at the conference that one of the most important aspects of organizational and political activity in the schools at the present time is instilling in students reliably strong and steadfast sentiments of patriotism

and internationalism; including a thorough knowledge of the history and culture of Belorussia, the establishment of high-caliber international relations, and the reliable mastery of the Russian and Belorussian languages. Currently, dedicated efforts are being made in the republic to improve Russian and Belorussian language instruction. In accordance with measures outlined in academic plans, the number of hours of instruction in Belorussian language and literature have been increased. A transitional program scheduled to commence in 1989 has been devised for Belorussian language instruction in schools with Russian language instruction from the second class. New school plans and programs have been prepared, and groups of authors have been formed to develop new textbooks and teaching aids. The number of schools with in-depth instruction in Belorussian language and literature was increased in academic year 1987-1988 and a plan for their further extension worked out.

The conference took note of the fact that the unjustified practice persists in the republic of releasing children from the study of Belorussian in the schools that have Russian-language instruction. Whereas 90 percent of students in the city of Minsk and 30 percent of students in the republic did not study Belorussian in 1969, at the present time these figures are 8.5 percent and 3.6 percent respectively.

A great amount of attention was given to improving the training of teachers in the field of Belorussian language and literature, and also to better providing them with textbook supplies in higher, middle, and mid-level special schools. Closer coordination was called for in the resolution of these problems by national education organs and republic writers' organizations. Ways were considered to stock school libraries with new books, including works by Belorussian writers. There was also discussion about how to improve the quality of the newly established republic journals *BELARUSKAYA MOVA* I *LITARATURA W SHKOLE* and *KRYNITSA*.

In the course of the conference problems were discussed concerning the development of Belorussian literature for children; increasing the role of literature and the visual arts in inculcating in students high qualities for citizenship; and improving book-publishing in the republic.

N. N. Mazay, deputy chairman of the BSSR Council of Ministers, took part in the discussion.

12889

Estonian 'Greens' Movement Activist Speaks Out
18000381 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 13 May 88 p 4

[Monologue by Ayn Payumyae, associate of the physics department of the Tallinn Polytechnical Institute, recorded by G. Diomidova: "I Am a 'Green,' Or Why I Joined This Movement"]

[Text] He appeared at the editorial office in the morning with several large envelopes in his hands. In the envelopes was a text intended for newspapers telling the story of the first large meeting of "Greens," which took place in early May in the House of Political Education, plus an appeal-demand to the public and the republic authorities adopted at this meeting.

We started talking, asked him a question and he answered. An unusual answer. The tape recorder was turned on. This monologue by the associate of the physics department of Tallinn Polytechnical Institute, Ayn Payumyae, came about in this way.

I personally have been missing such a movement for a long time. I read something about the "Greens" in the press. As soon as the initiative group emerged in the republic I understood that it was for me.

I will try to explain by my own example why Estonians regard this movement with such caution. My mother was in a German concentration camp when she was young and escaped the ovens by a miracle. My father was also in a camp, but he was in Siberia. He returned an invalid, you see. Many of my peers have parents with the same fate. That makes a person feel history deeply. For the 4,000 years that Estonians have lived on this most rocky and unfriendly land they have lived in the draft of history. A small people in the way of large nations and major state confrontations. The four millennia of the fate of families and the life of whole tribes depended on how the wheel of fortune turned. The land was the only defense and bulwark for the Estonian. He bit into it, he squeezed in, and he survived. An Estonian cannot be without this land. It is in truth his flesh.

On the other hand, tragedy teaches moderation. For a sense of measure is inseparable from intellect. I want to protect my land and I want to do it intelligently. The "Greens" is a movement of intelligent and by no means extremist people. At least for me. Throughout the world it is a leftist progressive movement. It is true that many people consider it a temporary one. But I think that the "Greens" have enough causes for a long time. Because the "Greens" movement is healthy opposition to industrial omnipotence under any government, even the most humane and progressive one. For on the scale of the whole world, something always escapes the field of vision of official organs.

The activity of the "Greens" is fertile ground for expanding the people's diplomacy. Protecting the environment—and that after all is not only the natural environment but also the cultural and psychological environment which defines the way and quality of life—is a universal cause. Moreover, our "Greens" are sincerely fighting to consolidate the republic's population. We breathe the same air and drink the same water and the same noise irritates us. And we must act together. And that is precisely why the very first large meeting of the "Greens" had synchronous interpretation. There will also be interpretation in the future and Russian-language events will be held.

For those who come to us for the first time I would say this: do not be afraid if you hear sharp and emotionally directed statements. The emotions will pass and cool down and the cause will remain and the clear goal will show through: to balance the extremes—domination by industry on the one hand and its absolute rejection on the other. Do not believe them if they tell you that the "Greens" are calling everyone back to caves or propose eating nothing but cheese. Caves are by no means a friendly atmosphere for mankind. Against industrial domination—of course. But after all, it is also absolutely clear that industry was developed and will continue to be developed. The question is how and what will it be like. What in the end exists for what—production for man or man for production which devours his health.

Therefore, I, for example, believe that industry should do a great deal more for man to become reconciled to it. And I share the viewpoint of the "Greens": it is unfitting for today's economic policy to make our environment hostile to ourselves.

I once heard a biting question, whether the "Greens" come to their meetings in cars and harm nature. Once again I remind people: we are not extremists and we do not cry, "Down with technology!" And there have to be cars, but... the kind which do the least harm to nature. There should be a refrigerator in every home, but with our winter and long cold fall do we need one that always works in the same mode and heats up the kitchen itself? Perhaps we could use some kind of natural cooling for most of the year, for example by installing coolers in the walls.

In short, we are for reasonable technology and for producing only goods that are necessary, economical, and of high quality. But to dirty the land and poison the air and water so that output gets covered with dust and spoils in storehouses since no one needs such a thing... No, we must not allow that.

Allow me one more personal comment; I am certain that the "Greens" movement is a cause that is in general deeply personal. A month and a half ago I buried my brother. He was 42 years old, an intelligent man, and all his life worked and studied, did a great deal, and achieved a lot. And then... stomach cancer. He died of

hunger. I talked with many people there in the oncology department. That is where people begin to understand what a good or a bad environment means to life—everyone from the kolkhoz driver who used to throw left-over fertilizer into a neighboring stream to the economist who "scrimped" on purification structures and the food trust worker... Ah, how they all understand, how much they are prepared to do in the name of life! Only they no longer are allowed the time.

But for now we are alive and well, at least relatively, and for now items, interest rates, tons, and bonuses are more important to all of us.

Each person is busy with his own things. But the environment is the same for everyone. And it can only be polluted to a certain level. For now it can resist us itself and clean itself up to some degree. But later—it will be it, overload. An irreversible process. And ultimately we really will be risking returning to caves, and by no means virginally clean ones but caves dirtied and poisoned as a result of a universal catastrophe.

For this not to happen, each person must take care to keep his own house clean. That is difficult, since the leading specialists of departments which are designing, let us say, a large chromium production facility next to the Narva Leather Plant live a long ways from Narva and from Ivangorod. And according to the departments they have two equally harmful production facilities which are even in different republics, so it would be useless to harp about it. But in fact they are on one small river, the Narva. It does not have any life in it with just one plant. But if there is a second next door...

So our industry itself forces people, even those who think in strictly national terms, to go beyond this. And for me and for my close circle the "Greens" movement is international by its very essence. We have a national aspect, but not in the political sense—it is from the standpoint of the diversity of the world. For nature strives for diversity, and we are obligated to help her rather than resist her. The disappearance from the face of the Earth of a nation and a people is much more terrible than an animal species which is becoming extinct and which we carefully enter into the Red Book. But departments naturally have nothing to do with such subtleties. It is profitable for them—and that is all. But using just a bit of mathematics, you can figure that overloading industry into a rayon with a developed infrastructure harms the population living there who with their own hands created the infrastructure which is so desirable to the departments.

Such a utilitarian approach is especially intolerable in conditions of socialist economic management. The "Greens" movement, by the way, understands perfectly all the advantages which the power of the Soviets provides for the struggle against narrow departmental interests and intends to use them actively, purposefully, absolutely responsibly, and within the bounds of the law.

Any slogans of an extremist-destructive nature, anti-Soviet pronouncements, and acts of vandalism are infinitely far from the "Greens" platform. So it is extremely unpleasant for us that people whom we did not know and whose slogans and actions were not coordinated with us joined our column in the First of May parade. We immediately thoroughly discussed and condemned what happened and came to the conclusion that we have too little experience and we did not manage to deal with the column which spontaneously grew and which marched under the aegis of the "Greens." We will be smarter from now on.

We need comrades-in-arms, but people who are honorable and sincerely interested in the cause.

I do not want to turn my speech to the detailed program of activity of the "Greens" today. First of all, an initiative group is still working on it and I do not want to come to the people with unprepared ideas. Secondly, I am speaking of myself and on behalf of myself here. But I know for certain that any constructive suggestion will be adopted and comprehensively considered. I am certain that we must work with children as much as possible and instill in them a sense of unity with nature and interdependence of every living thing on earth. But in general the slogan of the "Greens" is "Once you have decided, do it." I do not think I am the only one who feels close to that slogan. Especially if one takes into account the goal: a good environment for each and every person.

12424

Estonian Inter-Ethnic Tensions, Press Behavior Criticism Addressed

18000382 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian
19 May 88 p 2

[Article by V. Ivanov, head of the propaganda department: "Uneasiness with the State of Inter-National Relations Is Expressed in Letters Received by the Editors"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] Their quantity, and what is more—their content, as well as the meaning of some of the expressions in the republican press, on radio, and during meetings with our readers—all of this, taken together, convinces us of the necessity to set forth our point of view on this subject clearly and unequivocally.

To begin with—about the letters. Every day, the mail brings more and more new bundles of envelopes containing the opinions of readers on the most diverse aspects of the national question. And since the beginning of the year, already more than a hundred such letters have been received.

We emphasize: The people who write are different—in terms of age, profession, and social position, people who live in large cities and small settlements, who have come

to Estonia recently or who are keeping count of already more than one generation of ancestors in this land. But with all the diversity of differences, they have a common, unifying source—anxiety, not to say uneasiness with the bad situation that has developed.

Even simply to enumerate the names of all the authors of the letters seems impossible—the list would turn out to be too long. For this reason, we ask all those who wrote to the editors on the mutual relations between nationalities to consider this article as an answer to their concrete letter as well.

And a few more general considerations arising from our familiarity with the editorial mail. In publishing materials on this subject, we already more than once have turned to our readers with the appeal: To display a maximum of restraint and tact in the discussion of questions having to do with nationality. We have warned: Letters containing disrespectful expressions addressed to the representatives of other nationalities or written in an incorrect tone, not only will not be published, but will also not be considered since they do not correspond to the constitutional provision concerning the equality of all nations and the inadmissibility, in any form, of propaganda of national exclusiveness or national superiority. And nevertheless. . .

Another cautioning aspect: In many letters, one and the same motif is repeated in different ways—WE (i. e., the representatives of other peoples who have come to the republic) have helped THEM (i. e., the Estonians) to build, restore and erect and so forth, and now THEY do not want to accept us for people. . .

But again: WE are working in the most difficult sectors and in the low-prestige sectors, and THEY—in the service sphere, in the cushy offices, and other advantageous places. . . Moreover, the authors of such letters, as a rule, emphasize that they themselves are convinced internationalists, who do not feel any enmity toward another person only because he speaks a different language.

But let us calmly and without emotion look into the question of assistance. In my view, all of us, without exception, must firmly learn the simple truth: After the war, the destroyed national economy, including on the territory of Estonia, was restored in the interest of the industry and agriculture of the whole country, for which manpower from many republics was involved, since the resources of the local population were clearly inadequate for this.

As far as some projects are concerned that were built in the republic in later periods, as is being revealed today, the appearance of a significant part of them was called forth, above all, by the bad consequences of the extensive method of the development of the economy.

In this connection, the insistent repetition of the motif "what would they have done without us?" seems at least tactless and is reminiscent of an attempt to present an overdue promissory note. And besides, the division of the inhabitants of the republic in accordance with the principle "we" and "they", the opposition of people to each other on this basis, the scrupulous calculation of how many people and of what nationality work in this or that "cushy" job, and how many and of what nationality—in a job that is "not cushy"—such an approach, in the presence of all the declarative statements about the adherence to the friendship and equality of all peoples, does not call forth confidence in the true internationalism of the person who is doing the talking.

It would clearly be stretching the point, to put it mildly, if we were to attempt to convince our reader that the nationalist manifestations on the part of some portion of the indigenous population with respect to the inhabitants of Estonia who came from other regions of the country is an invention of ill-wishers or a trifle, which does not deserve attention and a serious assessment. Unfortunately, there really are such manifestations and they have at times an intolerable character.

But we are deeply convinced that it is first of all and mainly the Estonian-language mass media and the broad public of the Estonian part of the republic's population which should take up such incidents and their thorough analysis and principled assessment. In their turn, the non-Estonians living here, as well as the newspapers, journals, radio and television programs that appear in the Russian language, would make a still more significant contribution to the cause of strengthening international relations and the friendship of peoples if they would take the utmost irreconcilable position to any sort of manifestation of great power chauvinism.

An important amplification: We are talking about cases which do not go beyond the limits of the law. When we are dealing with acts of hooliganism that threaten the health, honor and dignity of citizens, with outrages perpetrated on state symbols, with the opening of graves—especially when all of this has a nationalist or chauvinist tinge—it is necessary, without hesitation, to put a stop to such escapades in accordance with the full strictness of the Criminal Code, which contains the relevant articles. If the law enforcement organs manifest indecisiveness, their staff members should be called to account. *Socialist legality must be observed at all levels.*

Recently the term "naive chauvinism" has become rather popular. It is implied that its bearer is not a conscious advocate of the supremacy of a great nation over all the other ones and that the views and actions of such a character are manifested in him "without malicious intent". . .

But naive or not naive, chauvinism—as well as nationalism—is mortally dangerous for inter-national relations if it exceeds "the permissible dose." And this dose, we note, is extremely small.

The goal of today's publications is not to condemn and not to establish guilt, although we could already today name many names of authors whose letters aim at sorrowful reflections on this plane. We simply wish to summon all our readers to the ability to be patient, to tactfulness, to the desire to hear out and to listen to an opinion that does not coincide in something with your own.

If we talk about the role of the mass media in international education, we will share the two, in our view, most topical aspects in today's situation.

First of all, about the perception of information. Frequently we receive indignant letters apropos materials published by the Estonian-language press. Apparently, the Estonian editors, too, receive mail containing criticism of statements of the Russian language mass media from their audience. It seems that the authors of such letters do not take into account one very important detail: They undertake to judge a publication intended *entirely for another national audience*, moreover approaching it with their own measures.

But it must not be doubted that every people is inclined to treat the same events differently and to assess the the same information differently psychologically. Psychological peculiarities make even the members of one family and relatives unlike to one another, and what is there to say about different peoples.

And the reason for the different reaction to one and the same "irritant" does not lie in the fact that one is good and the other bad or the other way around. But in the fact that *our national character is inclined this way*. And it is not worthwhile today to embark upon a fruitless search of the answer: Who in this connection is better, and who is worse? You must perceive the person living next to us for what he is, not demanding that he without fail should start to resemble you in everything, dress like you, walk as you walk, and think the way you do. *And it is necessary to be able to single out and to make use of what can be brought together; to find points of contact, and not to accent attention to the differences of the positions.*

In this connection, it seems appropriate to make some remarks apropos recent statements in the press and on the radio, all the more so because they concern our newspaper directly.

On 30 April the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII published the interview "Let Those Who Have Ears Listen" with the writer Teet Kallas. While on the conducted in the spirit of goodwill and the aspiration for mutual understanding, the appearance of the well-known prose writer, however, did not end without criticism of existing shortcomings. Another position, though, would be more than strange today. But here, speaking about the inadequate information, as well as about the disinformation of the Russian-speaking population of the republic

with respect to the most vitally important problems of Estonia, the writer exclaims: *... things have already gone so far that, in the pages of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA the chairman of Gosplan, Paulman, issued a political accusation against cost accounting: The desire to join perestroika precisely with one's own possibilities, to make a contribution to it as soon as possible, was qualified as a conspiracy of the Estonian-speaking population against the Soviet Union or the Russian-speaking population."*

We shall leave aside the style, syntax and grammar. We shall also not begin to focus attention now on the somewhat, let us say, broad interpretation of the meaning of the article of V. Paulman, a candidate of economics ("Measured Off Seven Times", SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA, 4 December 1987). What is significant is something else: As a negative example, only one publication from our newspaper is cited that is devoted to this subject. However, in addition to the author named, Academician A. Keerna, Academician V. Palm, candidate of philosophy E. Savisaar, and other specialists expressed their views on cost accounting in the pages of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA. The opinions of many of them disputed and even directly refuted the point of view of Paulman. Why did T. Kallas, for the sake of fairness, not also mention these statements? Otherwise it turns out that, in fighting against one-sided information, the writer achieves in actuality precisely the opposite effect: He creates among *his* audience a distorted concept of the position of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA with respect to the republic's cost accounting. And is this not disinformation?

To return persistently to the old sins and to focus the main attention *only on them* does not mean at all to promote the search for, and the realization of, constructive solutions of the problem.

Quite a few cases of that sort could be cited. But the purport of today's discussion does not lie in the search for them or in the justification for each individual case.

Free discussion, the exchange of opinions, and the open expression of one's point of view on the most acute questions without fail reveal the lack of convergence of positions, and there is nothing surprising, and all the more—strange—here. If, of course, one can *convince* an opponent of one's correctness. It goes without saying that our newspaper is not free of shortcomings. And we—without pleasure, but with attention—are ready to listen to critical remarks addressed to us, with a well-argued analysis of our mistakes. I would simply like to recall once again: Criticism can be effective only when the selection of cases supporting it is devoid of preconception and a touch of subjectivism; when the discussion is conducted in a correct and respectful tone.

Many readers in their letters ask why SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA does not publish the full text of the concluding documents of the joint plenum of the governing boards of the republic's creative unions. And although

today, after they have already been published in the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII (13 May of this year), to return to this subject, it would seem, does not make sense, nevertheless, most likely, it is necessary to dot all "i's".

First of all: On 8 April, the materials of the plenum were given in summary form in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA, including—the appeal of its participants to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, to the leadership, and the entire creative intelligentsia of the republic. And on 29 April the newspaper published the report of the Estonian Telegraph Agency about the session of the Bureau of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee with participation of representatives of the creative unions ("To Serve the People Is the High Mission of the Intelligentsia"), where, in particular, a quote from the statement of the secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, I. Toome, was cited: *"The creative unions in the decision petitioned for the publication of the documents adopted at the plenum in the republic party newspapers. I would like to note that their publication in the organs of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee will signify that this is the point of view of the Central Committee as well. But we cannot agree with all the points of these documents, about which I have already spoken; nevertheless, these documents were also published in detailed summary in the party press."*

In connection with this, I would like to add the following. We received several dozen letters on official stationery of various enterprises, organizations and institutions (many addressed not only to our newspaper, but, with copies, also to the editors of the newspapers RAKHVA KHYAEL, NOORTE KHYAEL, MOLODEZH ESTONII, and other publications). They state that, having discussed the materials of the plenum of the republic's creative unions at a meeting of the primary party organization (or at a meeting of the labor collective, public organization, etc.), the participants of the meeting express their full support of the speakers at the plenum and approve the concluding documents adopted at the plenum. The authors of such letters ask that the decision of their meeting be published in our newspaper.

In particular, such a request was addressed to us by the workers of the Tallinn Fruit and Vegetable Kolkhoz, the Estkolkhozstroy Planning Institute, the ESSR Geographical Society, the Special Design Office of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Language and Literature of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, and other departments and institutions.

We ask all who sent us such letters to understand us correctly: No having printed the text of the concluding appeals of the plenum of the creative unions themselves, the editors do not consider themselves as having the right to publish the text with the expression of the full support of these documents by your collectives.

Some considerations—apropos how well informed the Russian-speaking part of the republic's population is. The impression is taking shape that the majority of claims addressed to us in regard to this reduce themselves to the demand: To reprint "one by one" all documents on topical questions being published by Estonian-language publications.

But, first of all, this is impossible for purely physical reasons alone: Even if we would fill the pages of our newspaper exclusively with such reprints, its volume would be patently inadequate for this purpose. But all the same we will not get rid of the claims—now already apropos the lack of a point of view of our own of what is happening around us, our principal position. . .

And secondly: SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA, in one or another form, acquaints the reader practically with all urgent problems that are characteristic of the life of the republic. This pertains to regional cost accounting, international relations, phosphorite developments, the reconstruction of the Baltic GRES, as well as the plenum of the creative unions (besides the already named materials, see, for example, the interview with the writer Vladimir Beekman "How Our Word Is Recalled. . ." in the issue for 16 April of this year), and many other vitally important subjects. So that a person, who more or less attentively traces our publications, is able—if he so desires—to draw from them a maximum of information that interests him.

The editors are by no means inclined to deny the existing shortcomings in their work. However, taking into consideration the just criticism on this account, the newspaper aspires to correct them by filling in the gaps in the integral picture of the conceptions of the reader concerning the situation that has developed in Estonia today.

This goal, for example, is served by the surveys and commentaries of the Estonian language press being published every 10 days in recent months.

As far as the "burnt" facts and "sensational" materials are concerned that appear (or supposedly appear) from time to time in Estonian-language periodicals—and, apparently, it is precisely on their verbatim reprint that the most radical advocates of "adequate information" insist first of all—our newspaper, in the future, too, is inclined to avoid consistently such publications, and precisely from considerations of the inadmissibility of kindling the passions, the exaggeration of individual incidents that intensify discord. *We strive to cultivate in the pages of our newspaper a balanced, well-argued and correct analysis of the most fundamental propositions, avoiding, as far as possible, the relishing of "piquant details."* It is entirely probable that we do not always succeed in keeping on the same high level. But, in any case, the staff members of the newspaper are guided in their work by precisely such criteria.

However, in the letters received by the editors one also encounters judgments of another order. Their authors indignantly demand that the "high-handed intelligentsia be given a rap over the knuckles"; that those be "put into place" who express pernicious judgments; that the public figures be "called to order" who play into the hands of Western intelligence services. . . . In these expressions one can clearly observe adherence to the command-order method of solving problems that arise, one can perceive echoes of the same "administration by injunction" that has given rise to the majority of the acute problems existing in society today. The worthlessness and basic depravity of those methods have been demonstrated by life itself, and there is hardly any sense in returning to them, even for the sake of the realization of the best intentions.

Sometimes it is necessary to clash with contrary opinions being expressed in letters and at meetings of the workers of the editorial board with readers: Through its publications on the national question, the newspaper only works at the aggravation of inter-national relations and intensifies discord. The adherents of such a point of view justify it by the fact that "previously there were no publications of that sort in the press, and all nations and peoples lived in friendship, and there was no nationality problem."

Is it necessary to specify more precisely that the authors of these statements are confusing cause and effect? As is well known, until relatively recently we not only "did not have" a national problem, but also train wrecks, accidents in enterprises, and even natural disasters had only a foreign "registration", mercifully avoiding our state. . .

Today we openly discuss our problems, bring to light their reasons, calling what is white—white, and what is black—black, aspiring to perceive other shades of the spectrum as well. And if some of the subjects raised in the press turn out to be painful. . . . Why, a disease must be treated, but not driven inside, pretending that everything is all right. And every disease, as is well known, has its initial incubation period, its acute condition, and its crisis, after which—if the diagnosis is correctly made and the correct treatment is administered in time—recovery follows without fail. It is only necessary to master this crisis, to find a method of radically influencing the virus. And broad glasnost—in the understanding of Lenin—is the sword which itself cures the wounds inflicted by it.

In philosophy there exists the concept of "the categorical imperative". If we repudiate the special scientific terminology and try to define its meaning in generally accepted language, as applied to the concrete subject of today's discussion, it means that everyone of us should act with respect to the other as he would wish that they would act with respect to himself. Beginning with the

level of everyday intercourse and ending with participation in the solution of the large-scale tasks of politics, the economy, demography, ecology, and other spheres of the life of society.

We shall remember this golden rule.

8970

MVD Official Recommends Greater Use of Electronic Warning Systems

18000390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 6

[Interview with Militia Maj Gen L. Popov, director of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs' Main Administration of Nondepartmental Security, conducted by A. Chernenko: "Armed but Not Dangerous: Or the Anatomy of Self-Serving Disorderliness"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] A distressing fact: at the end of the 20th century, in the age of electronic miracles, our state has to maintain more than 400,000 security guards at 70 ministries and departments! Those ones who wear sheepskin coats and are armed with 19-century rifles! Why? This is the subject of our conversation with Militia Maj Gen L. Popov, director of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs' Main Administration of Nondepartmental Security.

[Popov] In and of itself, this situation arouses not even perplexity but fully understandable indignation. After all, our country exports electronic "guards" that enjoy rather high prestige in the international market. How stagnant we have grown if we permit ourselves such wastefulness—a half-million security guards! And judging from crime statistics, they are by no means always dangerous to thieves. The officially recorded sum alone of losses from shortages and thefts has doubled in the past two years and reached 245 million rubles last year. In 1987 officers from our nondepartmental security forces alone arrested 479,502 people for petty theft. As they say, beyond that there's nowhere to go. But where do the cracks in the law-enforcement "fence" originate? Why is it that year after year, despite the numerous measures and decrees, they grow wider and wider? Unfortunately, in security operations today one encounters profanation, on the one hand, and incompetence, on the other. The drafting of various uncoordinated, poorly thought-through and arrogant security instructions and regulations in the offices of the most diverse ministries and departments has resulted in the fact that the situation today has become exacerbated to the utmost. Moreover, it is complicated by the fact that all the absurdities it gives rise to play right into the hands of the foes of restructuring.

[Question] And specifically?

[Answer] If you will allow me, I will return to an incident that PRAVDA has already reported to its readers—the incident in the Frunze Department Store in Leningrad. A fire set by a criminal resulted in losses totaling more

than 3.5 million rubles. (And I assume this amount is rising as financial specialists calculate the indirect losses.) And then the newspapers had not even had time to report this emergency when the same "MO" was repeated in Krasnoyarsk at the warehouse of the kray trade administration's rayon poultry trade organization. After the robbers left, a fire. There was 150,000 rubles' worth of damage. Yet for years trade executives in both Leningrad and Krasnoyarsk had categorically refused to place their facilities under militia protection. They were defending their departmental prestige. So don't let trade personnel pretend that this incident was out of the ordinary. An absolutely typical case. Only the sum was extraordinary.

[Question] As I understand it, this is a matter of departments' reluctance to use the latest electronic alarm systems for security purposes and to enter into collaboration with internal-affairs agencies. And that stems not so much from sluggishness or disorderliness, as from some sort of deliberate motives.

[Answer] I believe that most economic managers avoid contact with militia agencies and prefer their own departmental security guards for quite deliberate reasons. They do not want anyone "poking his nose into their business," figuratively speaking. The following simple fact provides proof of this.

On the average, each enterprise in the meat, dairy and food industry unearths fewer than 100 cases of petty theft committed by pilferers each year. By contrast, during unannounced spot checks our services arrest as many as 100 pilferers in a single shift! So is it advantageous for an unscrupulous enterprise executive to conclude a contract with the militia?

[Question] As far as I know, the establishment of the Main Administration of Nondepartmental Security within the Ministry of Internal Affairs' system immediately resulted in the reduction of nearly a half-million security guards and subsequently made it possible to reduce their overall number by practically a million. So that alone says something about the economic effect.

[Answer] Plus a direct savings of almost a billion rubles. A single hour of protection provided by a security or military guard costs about a ruble. And the reliance on an electronic security system lowers this cost to 12 kopecks. (Only at facilities in the top category does this hour of protection cost 52 kopecks.) If you take into account the fact that today we are protecting about 2 million facilities, it becomes clear how economical the collaboration of economic managers with the militia is for our state. In the second place, in the event that our electronic service and certain units fail to work, we pay both an enterprise or the owner of an apartment that is under protection for 100 percent of the losses.

[Question] Your main administration is one of a few in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs that operates on the basis of cost accounting. Aren't you going broke?

[Answer] No, the effectiveness of our work today is rather high. Last year, say, we prevented fully 100 percent of attempted break-ins at savings banks. Of 500,000 apartments under our protection, we "let slip" only a few. That, I repeat, is an extremely high level of effectiveness. And since we have come to figures again, I will add something. Last year our service prevented 14,500 thefts from economic facilities. We arrested about 15,000 criminals who tried to break into warehouses, enterprise and institution safes, and premises where drugs, firearms and munitions were kept. More than 400 thieves were arrested in attempted apartment thefts.

Contact with the militia is advantageous both economically and morally, since no thief will break into, say, a plant safe or a state bank knowing that there is a double, or even triple, line of defense there. And a pilferer will not carry a sausage through the gate knowing that it is not "Auntie Masha" but an electronic guard that is on duty there. But is it advantageous to the economic manager who in the "good old days" of stagnation passed through the gate as if it were the threshold of his own home? Last year, criminal charges were lodged against 23,000 persons in positions of material responsibility for thefts and other crimes connected with personal gain. That included 4,000 executives and about 3,000 bookkeeping personnel! The mentality of the majority of them is extremely similar: "Drag off what you can get your hands on!" How many of them we caught literally red-handed at the gate! The director of a brewery considered it to be in the order of things to haul out two or three cases of beer in the trunk of his car. The director of a confectionery would do the same with a couple dozen boxes of candy. And it would be naive to think that the plant security guards who served at these executives' pleasure would risk searching their "boss."

[Question] Yet 36 years ago the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decree according to which a huge number of small trade and economic facilities were supposed to come under the protective wing of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. At the end of the 1950s, through a government decision, large enterprises also started to be transferred to nondepartmental security protection. And, as an acknowledgement of the effectiveness of that measure, in 1965 the government ordered all enterprises, institutions and organizations located in cities, rayon centers and workers' settlements, with the sole exception of the facilities of a number of defense-related ministries and departments, to be transferred to nondepartmental security protection. Why have matters stalled?

[Answer] As the ancients said, find out who benefits. Let us look at the statistics—since glasnost has made them fully accessible today. We have more than 16,000 premises containing narcotics, say, and more than 30,000 containing firearms under protection. We guard nearly 180,000 enterprise and organization safes. Yet we have only 3,000 under protection in light industry, a little more than 4,000 in the food industry, and 3,500 in the meat and dairy industry. And now let's take a look at

other figures and compare them to these. Of the 479,502 persons we arrested for petty theft, just a little under 100,000 pilferers were at facilities in the meat and dairy industry! There were also 100,000 thieves in the food industry! More than 30,000 of them were in light industry.

[Question] That is, the lion's share of thefts and thieves are found precisely at the enterprises that do everything possible to avoid putting in nondepartmental security guards?

[Answer] Precisely! There it is, the anatomy of "disorderliness." Underlying it is a self-serving approach, and not just an inability to set up the protection of state property. As soon as local authorities insisted on the introduction of electronic security systems at a number of agroindustrial facilities, nondepartmental security guards arrested 30,000 pilferers at enterprises producing sugar, yeast and alcoholic beverages. 150 tons of sugar and about 40 tons of alcoholic beverages were confiscated! Large groups of thieves who steal by the railroad carload flourish precisely in an environment of that sort of general, quiet and unpunished thieving at a given enterprise.

[Question] In your view, how justifiable is it to speak of a connection between such phenomena as "small-time pilferers" and large, corrupt criminal groups? Such a view has been expressed by dozens of PRAVDA readers.

[Answer] And they are undoubtedly close to the truth. I would not have cited all these figures on "petty" thefts if I had not been pursuing a perfectly specific goal—to show that the pilferer creates a large-scale atmosphere of mutual protection whereby "everyone is bound" and no one goes against the current. In that atmosphere, large-scale shady operators put down strong roots that produce not just criminal but anti-state and antisocialist shoots. It is extremely dangerous to close our eyes to that. Disorderliness, as you see, has perfectly deliberate, self-interested motives. And in my opinion, it is time to hold economic executives accountable for the fact that the aforementioned government decrees are not being implemented. In improving the system of rights, we should not forget about improving the system for protecting those rights.

[Question] In other words, concern for the safe-keeping of socialist property is also an element of guarantee that the laws on the labor collective and on the enterprise (association) are not being used for their own purposes by petty thieves who create systems of mutual protection where the "pistol" is wielded by "their own man," who is armed but not dangerous. I would like to add another idea. The experience of foreign countries shows that "electronic armor" not only has the ability to signal an emergency. It psychologically prevails over a potential criminal and stops him. On the other hand, it makes it possible to create a monitoring system that does not offend the honor and dignity of the honest person.

[Answer] Why just "of foreign countries"? We, for example, have now developed a system that makes it possible to utilize a person's temperature range. It unerringly spots a sausage, say, or some cheese that is hidden on someone's person. There's no need to do a body search that would offend an employee. But although the system has been developed and the capacity to produce it exists, economic managers are not moving to introduce it.

[Question] Frankly speaking, one question keeps bothering me. We keep talking about setting up monitoring and security systems, about replacing conventional security guards with electronic ones, and about setting up special prompt-response groups. But at the same time, aren't we too generous in the use of "live" militia to guard facilities that contain no material valuables or supersecrets at all that someone would be itching to get at. We thereby impoverish the service in other places. There's not a single ministry or even volunteer society that doesn't have a militia officer outside the door.

[Answer] I think you would be surprised to learn why militia officers, who might be utilized to much greater advantage for law-enforcement purposes, stand at the entrances of a number of ministries and departments. They are a shameful legacy of the period of stagnation, when people would fight to obtain a militia officer and a salary allocation for him from the USSR Ministry of Finance and USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs for the sake of prestige. Meanwhile, at that same ministry's economic facilities, a "granny with an old rifle" and, incidentally, very limited responsibility would be in charge. This constantly led to such—let's be frank—terrible statistics as the following. Just one fact. Last year alone, the officers of our main administration alone confiscated stolen products worth 3,704,512 rubles from "quiet pilferers." That is to say, today the problem of the pilferer is directly, shamelessly and maliciously striking at restructuring and the ideology of renewal. And that problem must be promptly solved. It is time to realize that it is utopian to think that security can be arranged by instructions alone, without the latest technical security devices (and, what's more, one's that already exist!).

[Question] The very presence of hundreds of thousands of guards, the need to improve security. In the 71st year of the Soviet regime, it is rather shameful to be speaking of this. As though we are protecting ourselves from ourselves. But let's not be sanctimonious: this is a problem for any industrially developed state. It is another matter that it is time to turn the protection of state and public property over to "people-free technology." In order, on the one hand, not to expend human resources so wastefully and, on the other, not to offend honest people.

[Answer] Precisely! The experience of all advanced countries teaches us this. Yet we still cannot make the ministry and department executives finally carry out a government decree that is already more than 20 years old. We are living at the end of the 20th century, and we are discussing problems that a good proprietor would solve in an instant.

8 Jun Comments of Theater Square Protesters in Yerevan

18300290 Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
9 Jun 88 p 4

[Article under "Reports" rubric by A. Bagdasaryan and S. Nuridzhanyan: "Theater Square, 8 June"]

[Text] Despite a burning sun, there were many people in Yerevan's Theater Square. Having gathered in small groups, people were heatedly discussing one and only one topic: the NKAO and the events around it.

Moreover, the gist of what was taking place could be ascertained by the contents of the numerous placards on the pedestals of the Spendnarov and Tumanyan monuments or hung on the walls of the theater. They called for the inclusion on the agenda of the upcoming session of this republic's Supreme Soviet of the question of its attitude toward the resolution passed by the NKAO Soviet, dated 20 February 1988. They also demanded that the law be correctly applied to the organizers and participants in the Sumgait outrages and pogroms.

Thousands of people representing various occupations have insisted on these demands at meetings being held these days in Theater Square. These meetings have assumed diverse forms. Here, for example, were the students. They have preferred sit-down demonstrations. A. Berberyan, a Yerevan Conservatory student, undertook to explain their collective platform to us.

"We've decided to demonstrate until our demands have been satisfied. We're convinced that implementing merely a socioeconomic reform in the NKAO would not solve the problem. Thus, we're expressing our solidarity with our fellow-countrymen from the NKAO who have already been on strike for many days."

The NKAO question is still far from being a closed matter. It will be considered at the appropriate level. Don't you think that the form of protest which you have chosen is unnecessary?

"No, we don't think so. Nobody has given us any guarantee that the NKAO question will be considered. We really do need guarantees."

We headed over to a group of people who had gathered around the Tumanyan Monument. After introducing ourselves, we asked whether anyone would state his or her opinion as to what was going on. This time our interviewee turned out to be R. Ovanesyan, a leading economist in the Gosagroprom.

"These meetings would not have been of such a mass nature if the central and republic-level mass information media had explained these events truthfully from the

very beginning of their occurrence. The lack of objectivity and the one-sidedness of the news media irritated people even more. As a result, the development of events has now become difficult to predict."

These persons who have been conducting a hunger strike in Theater Square from 4 June to the present refused to talk to us at first. But, after consulting with each other, they decided to allot a few minutes to the journalists.

Our interviewees here—the renowned builder and Hero of Socialist Labor, Garnik Khachaturovich Manasyan, and three of his comrades—stated the following:

"We don't trust the press. And, therefore, we'll grant you an interview only if you guarantee to set forth our point of view with absolute accuracy."

Here is what they said:

"Our demands are no different than what the people want. But we've chosen this form of protest, and that's our right. We've taken this extreme measure, and we'll abandon it if the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet to be held on 15 June includes on its agenda consideration of the resolution passed by the NKAO Soviet. That's our main goal. Along with this, we protest the fact that the trial is being held in Sumgait, and we demand that it be transferred to the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Court. We've spoken out against the distorted, non-objective explanation of the events as provided by the mass news media, primarily by the central media, which for some reason, have created a zone of silence around events taking place. Just how can we speak about glasnost under these circumstances?"

Indeed the news organs did let quite a few blunders slip through; these organs proved to be unprepared to explain such unusual and complicated events. But now, and this is really true, the situation has abruptly changed. Measures have been outlined which are aimed at normalizing the socioeconomic and moral circumstances in Armenia. Under these conditions is it worthwhile to call for a strike? Nowadays this would only hamper a stabilization of the situation and the normal process of considering the NKAO problem.

"I agree with you," A. Galstyan, an instructor at the Yerevan Polytechnical Institute, broke into the conversation. "This republic's leadership must be enabled to seriously study the entire complex of the problems which have accumulated in the republic, including those of international relations. This requires calmness and an even temper. Of course, the NKAO problems must be solved. And that will take time. But the court trial of the Sumgait murderers is something which requires a swift and just reaction. These persons should not be considered as merely hooligan-type elements. What we are dealing with here is a mass, group crime. And it must be deemed exactly as such."

A group of people from Sumgait were standing without signs, nor were they covered with slogans. They looked silently at what was going on.

"I cannot think about this without tears; it's a miracle that we were saved," said I. Akopova, a young mother. "But life goes on, and now we must deal with the new problems which have arisen for us. We've abandoned our houses and left our work. Many of Sumgait's Armenians moved to the NKAO, and some of us arrived here in Armenia. This republic's government is helping to resettle us and with job placement. We're thankful for that. In certain cases, however, serious difficulties have arisen for us. For example, it was proposed that our family be settled in one of the villages of the Bagramyanskiy Rayon. We would have agreed, but the fact of the matter is that my husband and I have a higher education in engineering, and we wouldn't be able to apply our professional skills there. We're waiting for other proposals and, meanwhile, we've moved in with relatives in Charentsavan."

Words of gratitude to the entire Armenian people were also spoken by other persons from Sumgait. The Land of Armenia received them all with understanding, and people shared with them not only their pain, but also their homes.

In talking with many participants in the demonstration about this topic, we felt how naturally they spoke about this, without any false heroism or pathos.

"When the Chernobyl tragedy occurred," we were told by V. Grigoryan, an official of the Yerevan Chemical Reactor Plant, "you know, all of us Armenians took it as if it were our own misfortune. A tragedy has also occurred in Sumgait. We're human beings—that says it all. And the fact that nowadays our people are showing a truly fatherly concern for those from Sumgait likewise explains the following simple truth: There's no such thing as someone else's misfortune."

Life has shown that this is indeed the case. And when we read in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference that "basic to the solution of this problem is a political course which combines satisfying the interests of all the nations with their drawing closer together and mutual aid." It becomes understandable what is being done nowadays by this republic for the socioeconomic and cultural development of the NKAO. And recently, among other measures, provisions were made for the targeted training of students from the NKAO at our republic's VUZ's.

This is just the beginning. The initial steps have been taken, and now it is a matter of taking the remaining ones. But that we take time. And, therefore, when some people among those on Theater Square call for a strike, this, as we noted, does not meet with the approval of many people. The latter said: Let's be restrained and sensible, without in any way removing the problem of

the NKAO from the agenda. Because, of course, the problem really does have to be solved. Such a solution is possible nowadays by means of the perestroika and the democratic path of development which have been proclaimed in our country.

2384

**Yerevan Protesters Praise First Secretary
Arutyunyan for 13 Jun Theater Square Talk**
*18300300a Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
16 Jun 88 p 2*

[Article by A. Muradov and G. Rubinyan, KOMSOMOLETS special correspondents: "Theater Square: One Day Before the Session"]

[Text] It would appear as though, trying to catch up for the past months, the republic mass information media have undertaken to provide extensive coverage of the latest events in Yerevan, related to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Reports from Theater Square appeared in the press, as it became a sui generis epicenter of events; There were radio and television broadcasts made by our most noted social figures, scientists and writers, who discussed the history of the problem and called upon the people to show wisdom, patience and tactfulness, and to avoid resorting to extreme measures with which to express their demands. The floor was also given to those who had already resorted to such measures: students who participated in the sit-in demonstration on Theater Square and at the Marshal Bagramyan Subway Station, and the participants in the hunger strike. A great variety of opinions were quoted and, which is important, without any cuts or polishing, respecting everyone's right of speech, the more so since this is a topic which excites everyone without exception. Putting these views together, the basic demand of the people was for the "Karabakh" problem to be considered at the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet.

On 13 June, S.G. Arutyunyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, addressed a meeting on Theater Square. He made public a draft decree of the republic's Supreme Soviet, which was entirely consistent with the expectations of the Armenian people, who demand the just solution of this painful problem.

On the eve of the session we once again went to Theater Square and the Marshal Bagramyan Subway Station to find out the people's reaction to the address by S. Arutyunyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, and the hopes they had for the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet. By the time you will be reading these lines, the session will have already passed a resolution on the problem of the NKAO, and we intend to present the responses to its results in our subsequent issues. For the time being, here are the views of the people, on the eve of the session:

G. Oganessian, lieutenant colonel, retired, party member since 1940:

It is probably self-evident that I, like everyone else, share the just demands of our people for the unification of the NKAO with the Armenian SSR. The mass meetings and demonstrations, which rolled like a tall wave over our republic, achieved their objective. I believe that all of us became convinced of this by hearing the speech by Comrade S. Arutyunyan. Could anyone ever remember an example of such a sincere discussion between the people and the head of a republic? I personally do not. Honestly speaking, I was shaken up by this speech. How can we not trust him? I believe that today to continue to give in to our emotions and to demonstrate for our demands, when we have been clearly told that they will be considered, means to act against the people. Everything indicates that some people do not like such a sober and businesslike approach to the problem. We must realize that democracy is by no means anarchy but a path which follows the laws of justice.

K. Tonoyan, grammar school teacher, Parakarskaya Eighth-Grade School:

Should mass meetings and demonstrations go on if our demand has been met: the consideration of the "Karabakh" problem at the session, based on the right of nations to self-determinations, as per Article 70 of the USSR Constitution? The very fact that they do indicates that the matter is not closed. I call upon everyone, the young people in particular, to the education of whom I have dedicated some 40 years of my life: be patient and show restraint. That is all that is demanded now.

O. Sagatelyan, YerPI student, participant in the sit-in demonstration at the Marshal Bagramyan Subway Station:

We are pleased by the fact that, although belatedly, the local press has begun to report the occurring events. This is yet one more proof that the activeness of the masses (meetings, demonstrations) are the motive force of the policy of democracy and glasnost, which is gathering strength. Strictly speaking, the address by S. Arutyunyan as well is a confirmation of this. However, we have decided to continue our demonstration until an official positive resolution has been adopted at the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet. If we find its resolution unsatisfactory, we shall reserve the right to choose new forms of expression of our demands.

As you can see, opinions are divided. Strictly speaking, we did not expect full unanimity. There were some who believed that meetings and demonstrations can only hinder the fastest possible solution of the problem, while others thought the opposite. However, the fact that on the eve of the session there was a newly gained confidence on the part of the people in the possibility of achieving a truly democratic solution to this problem, consistent with the expression of the people's will and

supported by the republic's leadership, was obvious...even against the background of continuing sit-in student demonstrations and the hunger strike by the four remaining hold-outs. This is confirmed by the fact alone that on 14 June a considerably fewer number of people went to Theater Square compared to the day before....

Something else: these days, time and time again, our readers have been telephoning the editors, asking about the state of health of the hunger strikers who abandoned the strike several days ago. We called the deputy chief physician of the emergency aid hospital No 2, I. Nadirova, who told us that the participants in the hunger strike who were taken to that hospital feel well and have almost recovered. We even met with one of the young people who had ended their hunger strike: Andranik Arutyunyan, a printing worker.

"I decided to end my hunger strike on the evening of 11 June," he told us, "and for the following reason: On that day we met with S. Arutyunyan, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, who assured us that this matter will be discussed at the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet. To continue with the hunger strike means to show mistrust in our leadership, which stated openly and unequivocally its position, responding to the demands of the people. The problem will be discussed nationwide, and this is guaranteed by the direct broadcasting of the proceedings of the session.

05003

Armenian Supreme Soviet Deputies on NKAO Crisis

18300300b Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
17 Jun 88 p 3

[Text] Seventh Session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation.

Debates at the Session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet on the Problem of Nagorno-Karabakh

From the speech by Deputy B.G. Stepanyan (V. Vagarshyanskiy Electoral District, Yerevan)

Comrade deputies! Today the Armenian Supreme Soviet is discussing at its session a draft decree which is a unique historical document, an unprecedented phenomenon in the history of a republic, a document born of the spirit itself of perestroyka.

The demand of Nagorno-Karabakh to join Armenia has spiritual, cultural and constitutional origins. This demand is based on Lenin's principle of the self-determination of nations. Today, with deep faith, we approve the submitted draft, convinced that it will open the way to the further establishment of the full truth. We think that the just solution of the Karabakh problem not only cannot and must not adversely affect friendship between

the peoples of Armenia and Azerbaijan but become a new foundation for the further strengthening of the international friendship among peoples.

Yes, in implementing the instructions of our voters, today we are adopting a resolution which maximally expresses the constitutional and legislative powers of the republic's Supreme Soviet. It was precisely for such a resolution that our people struggled. That is why I do not understand calls for new strikes and demonstrations, which were heard even after this draft resolution was made public. I am convinced that their authors are not our honest and dedicated young men and women and not the representatives of the working people.

In making use of the fact that our present session is being televised, I address myself to my constituents, my fellow-workers, my pupils of yesterday and today, as a mother, a teacher and elder comrade, at a time when your concern is shared by the party and the government of our republic, when your expectations are expressed by all deputies. Is it necessary, after all of this, to resort to extreme measures? This saps our strength, for our people must as yet resolve many pressing problems and tasks. The most topical of them is to regulate the pulse-beat of the republic, which has become excessively fast, so that life could follow a tranquil track and acquire its proper rhythm, and for the forces of our people to be directed toward the development of the country, the triumph of democracy, glasnost, social justice and friendship among the peoples and toward the cause of perestroika, and so that, highly aware of all of this, we may advance toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

From the speech of Deputy O.O. Abramyan (Stebastinskiy Electoral District, Yerevan)

Comrade deputies! Today we are discussing an exceptionally important problem. The people are quite well-familiar with the errors made in the past in relations among nationalities and, in particular, with the NKAO problem. Today, under present-day circumstances of glasnost and democracy, the opportunity has finally appeared to mention these errors as well publicly. I see in this fact the spirit of perestroika, one of the manifestations of glasnost and democracy. This is a new phenomenon in our sociopolitical life and, as such, demands of us even greater responsibility.

By this token we essentially support the concepts of the published theses of the party's Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, to the effect that within the framework of perestroika of the political system we must consider and take steps for the further development of the Soviet Federation and pay constant attention to problems of relations among nationalities and the development of each nation and ethnic group.

I am convinced that the present session, having approved the resolution of making the NKAO part of Soviet Armenia, will greatly contribute to normalizing

the situation, stabilizing the labor rhythm and reinterpreting and revolting all the steps taken by the party and the government for the further socioeconomic development of Nagorno Karabakh. Let all participants in the session rest confident that the working class in the capital will continue to demonstrate its labor will and will always act with its typical energy.

I use this opportunity to turn to my fellow-workers and, through them, to all of our working people with the appeal to show restraint in their feelings and actions, prudence and organization, so that we may always bear high the honor of the working person of Yerevan, and the reputation of the Armenian people. Here, at home, we have many problems the solution of which is a matter of honor for our entire people, including all people of Karabakh.

From the speech by Deputy G.G. Akopyan, (Kalininskiy Electoral District, Dilizhan)

Comrade deputies! Never before have the representatives of the people felt so responsible and obligated as today, when perestroika has inspired all social strata with the ideas of renovation and led them toward political cohesion and common objectives and aspirations. Correcting the fatal errors which were made during the years of stagnation instills in the young of today faith in the triumph of truth and justice.

To many of us the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh was the testing stone of sociopolitical activity. Today there is no longer any doubt that our young men and women are the worthy heirs of their revolutionary forefathers. We have satisfied ourselves that they are truly ready to become a motive force of social renovation, providing only that they are accurately guided and accurately understood.

For a time the problem of Karabakh drew attention away from the pressing problems which have accumulated in the republic. This leads me to the following thought: What great results can be achieved if we are able to convert the revolutionary energy of the young, their loyalty to the cause of transformations and their moral potential into a weapon in the struggle against social injustice and immoral phenomena, and for the development of democracy and broadening of glasnost.

We are confident that the young people of Azerbaijan will accept the resolution of our session as an expression of our constitutional right, which should not and must not adversely affect the good neighborly relations between the two nations. It was precisely in the spirit of this understanding that Azerbaijanis who, at the risk of their lives, in the tragic days of Sumgait, rescued many Armenians. This is confirmed by our numerous meetings with Armenian families which came from Sumgait. The Armenian people, the young, demand that the Sumgait tragedy be properly assessed and that the full severity of the law be applied against the culprits.

The problems which have accumulated in the field of relations between nationalities are the focal point of attention of the CPSU Central Committee. This was reflected in the theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. M.S. Gorbachev's address to the working people, to the people of Azerbaijan and Armenia, was a clear manifestation of the concern for the problems of and surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh. At a time of intensified emotions, with the power of truly Leninist words, it found its way into the hearts and souls of all working people in the republic.

In an atmosphere of fateful changes in the country, and on the eve of major political events, every one of us must act with the highest possible awareness of duty and responsibility and clear stance of party and civic-mindedness.

From the speech by Deputy S.M. Vardanyan (Vedinskiy Electoral District, Ararat'skiy Rayon)

Comrade deputies! Perestroika created an essentially new ideological-political situation in our republic, as it did throughout the country. This has made it possible to speak, criticize and correct shortcomings and unfair and erroneous decisions which have accumulated in the course of many years in our lives, openly and at the top of our voice. Unfortunately, they are many.

I am pleased by the fact that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, like many other unsolved problems of relations among nationalities, is in the focal point of attention of the CPSU Central Committee. One of the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee plenums will be dedicated to the discussion of these problems.

On behalf of all rural working people in the republic and my constituency, allow me to express our gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and, personally, to Comrade Gorbachev for the fact that the party is systematically pursuing a policy of glasnost and openness and free discussion of the problems of our past and present. It is only such a policy that can contribute to the moral recovery of Soviet society and to surmounting anything alien to the nature of socialism.

It is only such a policy that enabled our people to raise the question of correcting a historical injustice and making the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast part of the Armenian SSR.

I hope that the resolution we are adopting today will meet with proper response on the part of all nations in the USSR, including that of Azerbaijan, and will be approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The history of our people is rich in outstanding pages of true internationalism, brotherhood, mutual respect, good neighborly relations and cooperation with the peoples of the Transcaucasus and the other peoples of our great homeland. Under these circumstances, the crimes

committed in Sumgait are particularly scandalous and worthy of condemnation. We are worried by the situation in Shirazlu Village. The rayon's party members are making efforts to normalize the restless situation which has developed in that village.

We must never forget that we consider friendship and union among the peoples sacred and that today no one has the right to encroach on this union. Let me recall yet once again Comrade Gorbachev's wise words to the effect that the difficult problems of relations among nationalities can be solved only within the framework of the democratic process and legality.

We are confident that the question of uniting Nagorno-Karabakh with the Armenian SSR will be solved justly.

From the speech by Deputy G.R. Simonyan (A. Akopyanskiy Electoral District, Yerevan)

Comrade deputies! Today, when this question has been brought up for discussion at the Supreme Soviet Session, extensive hindsight speeches become unnecessary.

The first thing I would like to mention applies to self-criticism. We, deputies to our republic's Supreme Soviet, must find in ourselves the courage to express sharp critical words about the silence which has prevailed in the past months and, to put it mildly, the lack of attention to the appeals of the toiling masses, considering that the question of the very definition of the deputy as the servant of the people has been questioned in the republic. Who gave us the right to pass over in silence and ignore the demands of the voters?

The matter under discussion is clear: by the force of circumstances, Artsy, which has been Armenian since times immemorial and has been inhabited by Armenians, has gathered within it also members of the Azerbaijani and other peoples. It was renamed and became known as Karabakh. On the threshold of the establishment of the new system, after arguments and debates, this area was cut off of its native land, Armenia, and was made the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast. This situation remained for nearly 7 decades. Unfortunately, the pace of social progress slowed down increasingly, the area did not develop to the extent of the possibilities of the people, and the development of a national culture was held back.

Allow me to express my satisfaction with the motion submitted at this session on the Karabakh problem and to voice my confidence that all Supreme Soviet deputies will unanimously vote for the adoption of a resolution in that spirit.

Speaking on behalf of the republic's intelligentsia, let me remind you that we firmly link the solution of the problem we are discussing today to the success of M.S. Gorbachev's supporters and of perestroika at the forthcoming 19th All-Union Party Conference. Therefore

allow us, as communists and deputies of the Supreme Soviet, unanimously to demand of the Armenian delegates to the conference to stand firmly on the positions of perestroika and comprehensively to assist in the democratization and advancement of socialism and the intensification and development of the Leninist course.

From the speech by Deputy A.M. Kirakosyan (Sevan City Electoral District)

Comrade deputies!

The question discussed at the present session of the Supreme Soviet, the resolution of the oblast soviet of Nagorno-Karabakh on seceding from Azerbaijan and becoming part of Soviet Armenia, is a demand based on the Soviet Constitution and legislation and other legislative acts. This is a just demand which, for decades, was squeezed and strangled in the fetters of Stalinism but which, in the present encouraging atmosphere of democracy and glasnost, emerged on the surface as the true confirmation of the unconditional rejection of this cruel period and as a guarantee of the new awakening of the truth.

The deputy criticized the Union press and mass information media, noting that in their reports, particularly the interview "Following the Call of the Conscience," given by the poet Ye. Isayev, secretary of the USSR Writers' Union, published in the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Yerevan were misrepresented. In turn, the state organizations and the republic's leadership were unable promptly to draft a corresponding political document and submit it for information purposes to the CPSU Central Committee.

The deputy expressed his confidence that the directive-issuing authorities will give a positive reception to the just demand of our people on including the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within Armenia. The real guarantee for the objective and just solution of the problem is the policy of true democratization and glasnost, which is gathering strength with every passing day, currently pursued by the Soviet Union, and the close attention which the CPSU Central Committee pays to the national problem, manifested in particular in the ideas contained in the address delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the working people and the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, and in the theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, which were submitted for nationwide discussion.

05003

Regular Operations of Armenian Refugee Commission Detailed

18300291a Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
9 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by S. Dzhanyan, under rubric "Reports on Vital Matters": "The Placement Continues"]

[Text] Slightly more than four months have passed since the day of the tragic events in Sumgait. At the present time more than 700 families who have arrived from there are living in our republic. Some of the people found shelter with their relatives and friends, but the others have been billeted at various boarding houses and rest homes in the republic. Last Friday the ArSSR Council of Ministers enacted a decision to billet refugees on the territory of Armenia. A specially created governmental commission is engaging in these matters. Our story is about the work that that organization is doing.

This is the seventh day that the people who have decided to remain in the republic have gathered in front of the Gosagroprom building, which is on Lenin Square. The people who come here are those who have been living temporarily with their relatives, friends, and acquaintances—these are the people with whom this commission's work of providing services is linked. A similar commission in Agveran works with people who have found shelter in boarding houses. The commission members work without any days off, from early in the morning until evening. Today Council of Ministers responsible workers Sergey Megrabyan, Norayr Panosyan, and Suren Charyan are handling the incoming people.

It is impossible to discuss all the problems that the commission members have to deal with. In each individual case it is necessary to make a decision that is acceptable to both parties, and it is not always possible to do this. However, let's try to cite the most typical situations.

Roza Artashesovna Dadyan, person with Group II disability.

After leaving Sumgait, she lived for a short time in Akhuryan, and then moved to Yerevan. Now she has been assigned an apartment in Akhuryan, where she will live with her two children. Roza Dadyan is satisfied with that housing arrangement.

The Avanesyan families appealed to the commission. The head of the family, Andranik Moksesovich, is a worker by occupation. Immediately after the tragedy he left Sumgait and this is the fourth month that he has been living with his wife and three children with relatives in Yerevan. The family wants to stay in the city, but this is impossible. The commission recommends several alternative housing arrangements, but for various reasons they are not acceptable to the Avanesyans. The question remains open.

The housing problem is, in general, one of the most critical ones in the republic. The number of ready apartments to be assigned to the victims is not large, and they have been obtained, basically speaking, from people who yielded their place on the waiting list for housing, which is something that people have done without any coercion, realizing that aid must be given to a person who has been put in an unfortunate situation.

Or take another situation. Three related families decided to engage in individual construction. No problems arise here—the government allocates a plot of land anywhere in the republic, and grants long-term loans in amounts up to 20,000 rubles, to be paid off within 25-30 years. These people will be given the necessary assistance in purchasing building materials, as well as other assistance. In passing, the commission reminds people that, in the event that they express a desire to work on a sovkhoz, that sovkhoz will assume the paying off of a substantial part of the loan. But, obviously, deciding where and what to build is something that the people themselves have to do. There is absolutely no coercion.

The next family to enter the office is a family that recently came from Baku. The commission members explain to them that they will have to wait a while: at the present time, the matters that are being considered first of all are those that pertain to the Sumgait residents.

A certain hitch has occurred in the commission's work. People who have chosen as their place of residence the settlement of Metsamor have encountered certain problems with their housing arrangements. Sergey Rushanovich Megrabyan explains that the local agencies are required to find housing arrangements for the refugees with their own efforts, without sending the commission, but now two of its members are traveling, together with the "new settlers," to Metsamor, in order to analyze the situation on the spot.

People also want to know what is going to happen to the things that they left behind in Sumgait. That circumstance also has been provided for—after housing has been found for people, special truck trips to that city will be organized. As for the exchange of apartments, by today's date 55 families who have been able to resolve the questions of exchanging apartments have been registered in Masisskiy Rayon. The government will meet them half-way, by giving assistance in the amount of 4000 rubles per family, which amount is allocated for repairing the building. The debt must be paid off within 10 years.

One problem is especially worrisome to the people from Sumgait—the question of material support. The victims have been given material assistance, but, obviously, after four months have elapsed, the amount of money allocated has proven to be insufficient. The people who are living in boarding houses have a different situation—the government has assumed their support. But it is understandable that people who are living with relatives do not

want to cause any extra problems for the families that are sheltering them. Sixty-seven families have already requested supplementary assistance and that question requires the most rapid resolution.

By evening the stream of visitors thins out. It is time to sum up the results of the day. The commission has succeeded in finding a final solution for the question of an additional 16 families who have decided to remain in Armenia. According to the information pertaining to the activities of both commissions, as of 8 June there are 265 families, with a total of 1092 members, who are awaiting placement. In addition to that number, 437 families, with a total of 1688 members, have been placed; 45 families have expressed a desire to settle in Stepanakert, where they will be given apartments at the Armgasprom Production Association; 43 families have settled in Bagramyanskiy Rayon; and 80 families have made the decision to build their own homes on plots of land. Attempts are continuing to find housing for 40 families who live in various parts of Armenia—their questions are being resolved locally.

The commission is continuing its work.

5075

**Chairman on New Council's Intent to Address
Armenian Historical, Nationalities Issues**
18300291b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
15 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by Kh. Barsegyan, doctor of historical sciences, professor, chairman of the Interdepartmental Scientific Council on the Study of National Processes, ArSSR Academy of Sciences, ArSSR honored figure of culture, under rubric "Towards the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "Studying History: Internationalism and Armenian Soviet Historiography"]

[Text] History is mankind's memory, the spiritual property of nations. It cannot be rewritten anew or canceled! History is also our biography. By the burning of books and the appropriation of one's neighbor's spiritual and material monuments, it is impossible to enrich one's own history and culture.

And now a few words about internationalism. Socialist internationalism and patriotism are typical features of the Armenian nation. We have learned that from the literary heritage of Marx-Engels-Lenin and their internationalist followers. We have learned that from the labors and lifetime example of such ardent revolutionaries of the Leninist guard, such glorious sons of the Armenian nation, as S. Shaumyan, A. Myasnikyan, S. Spandaryan, B. Knunyants, S. Kasyan, A. Bekzadyan, S. Kasparov, and many other inflexible warriors and bearers of the ideas of proletarian internationalism. Those traditions are alive and are developing right now in Soviet Armenia.

The sons of the Armenian nation made a large contribution to spreading Marxism-Leninism and to creating Bolshevik organizations. They fought on the barricades in 1905 and 1917, were tempered in the crucible of the civil war, spilled their blood for the establishment of the Soviet authority in the trans-Caucasus, and gave unstintingly of their efforts and energy to create the Transcaucasian Federation, which was the forge of the internationalism and friendship of the nations in the territory.

Armenian Soviet historiography did not remain indebted to the development of the problem of proletarian internationalism. It could not be aloof from that development, inasmuch as the very life of the territory was always saturated with the spirit of internationalism. There was a single common goal, and international solidarity was necessary.

The methodological basis of the works of Armenian Soviet historians include works written by the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism and their followers. The works of Marx and Engels have been published, and the reader has received the first eight volumes of their Collected Works. Rich Leniniana has been created in the Armenian language. The fifth edition of the Complete Collected Works of V. I. Lenin was completed long ago. Collections of works of S. Shaumyan, G. Ordzhonikidze, A. Myasnikyan, A. Bekzadyan, A. Khandzian, and others have been published.

Under the aegis of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, under CPSU Central Committee, and by the forces of its Azerbaijani, Armenian, and Georgian branches, the following works were prepared and published: "Essays on the History of the Communist Organizations of the Trans-Caucasus"; "V. I. Lenin Concerning the Trans-Caucasus"; "V. I. Lenin Concerning Armenia and the Armenian Nation"; essays on the history of the Communist Party of the individual republics; and many other works.

Just as any living organism, any living idea, or theory is in dialectical movement, proletarian internationalism has underlying regularities in its development, which are closely linked with the political and socioeconomic history of our homeland. Especially since, quite recently, it was felt that the national question in our society had been completely resolved and that there were no more problems. In real political practice, however, the emphasis was made only on the tendency of rapprochement. Naturally, Armenian Soviet historiography also did not remain aloof from this enlightenment of the question. In actuality, the question is not an ossified or conflict-free problem. The national question continues to have unresolved problems, and can be improved. Wherever we departed from Leninist theory—and to a large extent we did depart from it—we departed from the Leninist national policy, and we must return to the great Lenin, must again confer with Ilich, must newly interpret the Leninist heritage.

Research on national processes has not always been on the proper level. During the years of stagnation, the development of the national policy, and questions of the theory and practice of national relations, were converted into a monopoly for Sh. Rashidov, D. Kunayev, and their underlings.

Historiography is largely indebted to the nation. It is obliged promptly to note, generalize, and analyze events and give them a true direction. At present, more than ever before, there has been an increase in the responsibility borne by social scientists—both to history and to the nation. It is well known that the nation, in the final analysis, will tell the truth, but the social scientists—and primarily we historians—have been called upon to help the nation. The national question is an extremely complicated and delicate question. The national and the international, the class and the national, are intertwined in a complicated manner and definitely require new thinking.

Unfortunately, in historical literature one sometimes encounters a one-sided illumination of the questions pertaining to the development of the nations of the USSR, and this heats up unhealthy moods. In individual instances there is a complexity in relations between nationalities. Questions that were hastily resolved in the past by the administrative method led to injustice, and inasmuch as a ban was placed on discussions on that topic, they periodically let themselves be known in the most diverse forms. In historical literature, the basic emphasis was placed on illuminating the global manifestations of proletarian internationalism, completely ignoring the fact that internationalism exists everywhere—in the socioeconomic development of nations, in the processes of migration, in the development of national culture, everyday life, and psychology. Any omission is fraught with complications that, sooner or later, make themselves known. Soviet Armenian historiography, unfortunately, has lost from its field of vision such an important problem as the scientific illumination of the socioeconomic and political history of Nagorny Karabakh. As long ago as the 1920's, as everyone knows, the status of Nagorny Karabakh was decided hurriedly and unjustly, and contradicted the Leninist principle of the self-determination of nations. We might note briefly that Karabakh (historically, Artsakh) is part of Armenia, the first bridge that united the Armenian nation with Russia. It was precisely Karabakh that was that part of Armenia which came in contact for the first time with the Russian nation and where the Russian political orientation of the Armenians developed.

It is well known that, immediately after the victory of the Soviet authority in Armenia (29 November 1920), the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan on 1 December 1920, over the signature of its chairman, N. Narimanov and People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Guseynov, proclaimed a declaration in which it was stated: As of today, the former boundaries between Armenia and

Azerbaijan are declared to be annulled. Nagornyy Karabakh, Zangezur, and Nakhichevan are recognized as being a component part of the Armenian Socialist Republic." The declaration of the Revkom of Soviet Azerbaijan, the just decision of the so-called moot territories, a decision that became possible thanks to the victory of the Soviet authority and the truly international approach to the question, caused a large patriotic upsurge among the workers, who were convinced that the Communist Party and the Soviet authority were deciding the complicated questions of international relations on the basis of justice and equality, in conformity with the interests of friendship and cooperation among nations. However, subsequently the decision of questions took a completely different course. A factor which, in my opinion, played a fatal role in this was V. I. Lenin's illness and I. V. Stalin's hastiness and crude administrative methods, and the political situation that had been created in Armenia as a consequence of the Dashnak revolt. At that time there were no ready models in the development of national relations. In 1923 the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast was formed as part of Soviet Azerbaijan, despite the fact that Armenians constituted the majority (more than 93 percent) there. In this regard it is extremely fitting to recall V. I. Lenin's prophetic words to the effect that "nothing restrains the development and consolidation of proletarian class solidarity so much as national injustice" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 45, p 390).

Let us return to our time, to the events of February 1988. In the final analysis, what did the Armenian population of Nagornyy Karabakh want? The Armenian population, the session of the oblast soviet, and the plenum of the party's oblast committee justly, within the confines of the Constitution, demanded, on the basis of the situation that had developed (obviously there is no need to list here the facts that are already well known from party and governmental documents that have recently been enacted), the transfer of NKAO from Azerbaijan SSR to Armenian SSR.

In Soviet Armenia, that news was perceived with understanding, and, as M. S. Gorbachev said, the events in Nagornyy Karabakh and Armenia were not of an anti-social or anti-Soviet nature. But in Azerbaijan this caused a reverse reaction, which led to the tragic Sumgait events, and this was a serious blow not only to proletarian internationalism, but also to the course of revolutionary perestroika. That which has occurred was not the work of a gang of hooligans who committed massive outrages, but, rather, has deeper roots. We might add that it was not only the party and Soviet administrative workers who proved to be poor internationalists, but also the leadership of both republics who, by their short-sighted actions, contributed to the creation of a chasm in the relations among nationalities.

A role of no small importance was played by the views that had been inherited from the 1930's and 1940's, according to which the slightest interest in national

problems or in attempts to analyze the frictions that were arising among nationalities was immediately given the label of nationalism.

M. S. Gorbachev, in his message to the workers and to the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, stated that territorial and other disputes between nationalities should be resolved democratically.

Let us again confer with Ilich: "...we say," Lenin wrote, "that boundaries are determined by the will of the population."

The February events will be subjected to additional careful analysis by Soviet historiography, which will sweep away all the unsubstantiated, tendentious evaluations and accusations that have been splashing off the pages of the press, radio, and television, deliberately or unintentionally distorting the essence of what is occurring in the region. Sooner or later, truth will rise to full height.

Under the present-day conditions, the questions of patriotic, international education arise in a new way. The recent events around Nagornyy Karabakh, PRAVDA wrote, have become yet another confirmation of the fact that genuine internationalism and true friendship are possible only if there is profound mutual respect for the dignity, honor, culture, language, and history of every nation (see PRAVDA, 18 May 1988).

An analysis of the events that occurred in Nagornyy Karabakh and around it indicates that the question of the territory to which Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast belongs is one of those first-priority questions in the sphere of international relations which must receive their resolution in the spirit of revolutionary perestroika and democratization in conformity with the absolutely fundamental principles of the national policy of the CPSU.

For the effective research and resolution of the previously mentioned tasks, an Interdepartmental Council to Study Processes Among Nationalities has been created under the presidium of the ArSSR Academy of Sciences, and that council has begun its work. The very name attests to its functions and its positions. The members of the scientific council include prominent scientists from the republic, the Academy of Sciences, the institutions of higher learning, and the ministries and departments, who deal directly with problems of relations among nationalities and who are capable of effectively elaborating questions of theory and practice.

To assure the further improvement of the relations among nationalities, the Interdepartmental Scientific Council to Study Processes Among Nationalities deems the following to be desirable:

1. The improvement of the forms and methods of propagandizing proletarian internationalism; the strengthening of the friendship of nations and the cooperation among them; the settlement of any questions of conflict that arise among nationalities; and the patriotic education of the workers necessitate the creation on a nationwide scale—at the CPSU Central Committee or in the government—an effectively operating apparatus (department, committee) to study and coordinate the processes among nationalities. It would be desirable to have an organ of the press, similar to the previously well-known magazine *ZHIZN NATSIONALNOSTEY*, that would be able in a Leninist manner to illumine the life of the union republic, to illumine the variety of the national relations, socialist pluralism, etc.

2. The experience of the past and the currently occurring processes in relations among nationalities, which processes have arisen at the present-day stage, during the era of perestroika and glasnost, persistently dictate the return to the absolutely fundamental Leninist principle concerning the self-determination of nations by means of nationwide discussion, the refinement of individual constitutional articles linked with administrative-territorial status, and the correction of the errors that occurred in the past as a result of hasty, crudely administrative decisions, wherever those errors make themselves known.

3. The creation of a quarterly regional magazine of Caucasian studies, under the Academy of Sciences of the trans-Caucasian republics—in the Azerbaijani, Armenian, and Georgian languages—with a single editorial board, which would discuss on a scientific level various problems of the history, cultural and internationality relations among the unique peoples of the territory.

4. The intensification of the attention shown to the interests of the national minorities in the particular republic; the respect for their culture, language, and national traditions and customs. Steps should be taken to promote the growth of the national cadres from among the national minorities, taking into consideration the Leninist principle that the nationalism of a small-sized nation is a defensive reaction to the chauvinism of a large nation. We might note that during the period of the two population censuses (1926 and 1939) the number of officially registered nations in the USSR was reduced to one-third (from 190 to 62), to the advantage of strong-willed political aims directed at the steady drawing together and "preterm" fusion of the nations and nationalities. Unfortunately, these processes did not prove to be in the center of attention of researchers of the national question, whereas those phenomena could not occur painlessly. Sooner or later the deviation from Leninist national policy had to make itself known.

In our opinion, during the USSR population censuses, the appropriate questionnaire data should not have ignored any nationality, even the smallest one. The column "and other peoples" should be taken out of

circulation. Thus, there will develop a rich national mosaic in the large house that we share in common, where each people—both the largest and the smallest—can feel national pride. Our unique multinationality is the wealth, the highest possession, the fruit of Great October.

5. We must renounce the old, slogan-type, and crudely administrative work methods, always keeping in mind the developmental peculiarities and uniqueness of every people, every nation, and responding sensitively to any processes in the relations among nationalities that hinder socialism or the policy of glasnost, perestroika, and the democratization of society. I would like to direct attention to the recommendation that the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet also penetrate deeply into the urgent problems of relations among nationalities, and restructure its work in the spirit of present-day requirements.

6. The creation, on the basis of the Sector of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Nations and National Relations, Department of Scientific Communism, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, under the CPSU Central Committee, of an independent subdivision to deal with the problems of the party's national policy, which subdivision could become the nucleus of a party-wide scientific center to deal with those problems.

We might recall that, many years ago, N. Karamzin said, "The historian must rejoice and grieve with his people. He must not, guided by partiality, distort the facts, exaggerate good fortune, or in his exposition belittle any calamity; he must be, first of all, truthful, but he can, or even must, communicate sadly everything that is unpleasant, everything that is shameful in the history of his people, and must also speak with pride and enthusiasm about that which brings honor, about the victories and flourishing state. Only in this manner can he become an author describing a national way of life, which is what a historian must be first of all" (see *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*, No 20, 1988).

The dialectics of the development of internationalism and friendship and of Soviet patriotism and the processes occurring in the relations among nationalities in various parts of the country suggest that one should take an extremely cautious attitude toward these questions, without the slightest infringement upon national dignity. They must always be in the center of attention of the ideological front and must be resolved in the spirit of our revolutionary time, in the spirit of the new way of thinking.

NKAO Shushinskiy Rayon Armenians Appeal to Conationals for End to Demands, Strikes
18300314a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
17 Jun 88 p 1

[Appeal by Amaliya Mirzoyan, secretary of the primary party organization at Shushinskiy Rayon Department of Public Education, Ashkhey Grigoryan, secretary of the primary party organization at a mechanized bakery, Svetlana Farsiyan, teacher at school No 1, Nura Arutyunyan, cashier at the Shushinskiy Rayon Interfarm Repair and Construction Office, Andranik Ambartsumyan, chief accountant at boarding school No 3, and Tigran Mangasaryan, carpenter at the Shushinskiy Rayon Repair and Construction Administration]

[Text] Dear comrades! We, Shushinskiy Rayon Armenians, appeal to all Armenians living in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, as well as in Armenia, at an extremely dangerous moment arising on account of the actions in this region of a group of nationalistically disposed elements putting forward an illegal demand on the transfer of Nagorny Karabakh to the Armenian SSR.

For more than 4 months the steps taken by the party and the government to normalize the situation in the oblast have not produced the necessary results. Conversely, the situation is becoming increasingly tense. It could have been assumed that the decree dated 21 February 1988 of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as subsequent decrees of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Accelerating the Social and Economic Development of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR in 1988-1993," would silence those that wanted a further heating up of events and everything would become normal there. However, this did not occur. Nationalistically disposed forces in the Armenian SSR and Nagorny Karabakh, which cast off all restraint during the period of stagnation, have produced a serious complication in international relations and are trying to introduce a split into the old-centuries friendship of Armenians and Azerbaijanis. As a result, there are mass demonstrations, meetings, and strikes, which, along with a moral blow to the sacred friendship of nations living in Azerbaijan and Armenia, have inflicted economic losses amounting to tens of millions of rubles.

Dear comrades! We, Armenians, have lived in Shusha in peace and harmony with Azerbaijanis for many years. From the earliest times our nations have been warming themselves at the same hearth and have shared the last piece [of bread] equally. As noted in the appeal by Baku's Armenians to conationals in Nagorny Karabakh, here, in the mountains of Karabakh, borders are imperceptible. We cannot even imagine them. Now, however, owing to illegal demands by conationals in Stepanakert, which are impossible to realize, we are deeply distressed and are ashamed to look in the eyes of our Azerbaijani brothers and sisters. None of us has ever suffered from

nationalism. "Garabakh shikestesi" was the hymn of our friendly relations. We shared both joy and sorrow. We became related and fraternized. Now, however, a group of irresponsible people use every means to poison these relations and even the great power of radio, television, and the press. Emotions are being stirred up and conditions are being created for setting off two nations against each other...

Dear comrades! Are the events in Karabakh not a stab in the back of restructuring? Don't they make our foreign enemies happy? We are not yet talking about the young generation. How much time will be needed to remove this dark stain from their souls?

Nagorny Karabakh is Azerbaijan's emerald crown and, like a mother, equally divides love and warmth between its twins—Azerbaijanis and Armenians. One—its own—blood flows in their veins. But now these nations are at loggerheads.

We appeal to your mind and reason: Control your emotions! During the momentous period in the life of our country—on the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference—give up your unfounded claims with respect to land! Return to your jobs and begin to work honestly. History will not forgive our nation this mistake!

11439

Lack of Legal Foundation for NKAO Transfer Demand Detailed

18300314b Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
17 Jun 88 p 3

[Report on talk with Abduyala Gadzhibaba ogly Ibragimov, head of the Legal Department of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet: "Contrary to the Constitution"; first two paragraphs are BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY introduction]

[Text] The central press published a report on the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, which examined the matter "Concerning the Decision of the Extraordinary Session of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR dated 20 February 1988 'On the Petition Before Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR Supreme Soviets on the Transfer of NKAO From the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR.'" As it became known, the session in Yerevan decided to give consent to the entry of Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast into the Armenian SSR and the republic's Supreme Soviet asked the USSR Supreme Soviet to examine this matter.

In connection with this a number of readers turned to the editorial department of BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY. They expressed their disbelief and asked for the necessary explanations. A correspondent of BAKINSKIY

RABOCHIY met with Abduyala Gadzhibaba ogly Ibragimov, head of the Legal Department of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet. We are publishing the talk with him.

It is not difficult to understand the readers. Such a decision by such a representative organ as the session of the Supreme Soviet of a Union republic does not have analogs in the history of our Soviet state. A decree was adopted contrary to our country's Basic Law—the USSR Constitution—and it has no legal or practical basis. In brief, it cannot change to the slightest degree the national-state structure of the Azerbaijan SSR and affect the status of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

I would like to recall that a meeting of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet, which examined the petition by deputies of the Soviet of People's Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast for transferring the oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR, was held 2 days earlier. Having examined this request thoroughly, the Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet considered it unacceptable, because its realization would contradict the interests of the republic's Azerbaijani and Armenian population and would not meet the tasks of strengthening friendship among all the nations of the Soviet country and the tasks of restructuring.

Of course, the attentive reader noted the following not unimportant circumstance: The Presidium of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet examined the appeal by deputies of the Soviet of People's Deputies of NKAO and the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, the decision of the extraordinary session of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies of NKAO. The difference is significant and fundamental. First of all, it is necessary to stress that the so-called session in Stepanakert held on 20 February of this year was groundless owing to the gross violation of the Azerbaijan SSR Law on Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. In particular, such a law states that "the executive committee of the oblast soviet advises deputies and informs the population of the time of convocation and place of holding of a session of the oblast soviet, as well as of matters submitted to the soviet for examination, no later than 2 weeks before the session." This point was not observed, because the session urgently examined a matter submitted on the day of its convocation and without any advanced notification. Moreover, deputies representing certain parts of the oblast were not at all informed of the convocation of this session and were not present at it!

Next, Chapter 14 of the USSR Constitution notes: "In its activity a deputy is guided by general state interests..." Unfortunately, NKAO deputies did not have such a view. They were captives of emotions and set particularly local interests, which they did not understand

correctly, against public and general state interests. The deputies seemed to forget that we live in a multinational country and are bound by a community of interests and fraternal aspirations.

I would like to note again: The decision of the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet is illegal and cannot shake the national-state structure formed and tested by life and by past decades. Chapter 9 of the USSR Constitution, article 78, points out: "The territory of a Union republic cannot be altered without its consent." The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of our republic did not give such a consent. Furthermore, the country's Constitution states firmly and unequivocally: The most important matters concerning state life are submitted for nationwide discussion and are put to a nationwide vote (referendum).

All of us know that the decree dated 21 February 1988 of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee stresses that the actions and demands aimed at revising the existing national territorial structure in our region contradict the interests of workers in the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR and do damage to international relations. For a solution of urgent NKAO problems a detailed decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers was adopted. It became a good basis for a dynamic social and economic development of the region of Azerbaijan. In order to execute it, a considerable volume of work has already been fulfilled and, as stated at the recent meeting of Baku's workers held under the slogan "For Restructuring, Democratization, and Internationalism," its rates should and will increase more and more.

I would like to note once again: Workers and the population in our multinational republic do not have cause for concern in connection with the decree adopted in the neighboring republic and under no circumstances should anyone of us be at the mercy of highly-strung emotions and give in to idle rumors and talk. The point of view of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet is widely known. On 23 March of the current year, in response to an appeal by a number of the country's Union republics, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a special decree in connection with the events in Nagorny Karabakh, in the Azerbaijan SSR, and in the Armenian SSR. I will permit myself to cite the following lines from it: "To consider it inadmissible when an attempt is made to solve complex national-territorial problems by means of pressure on organs of state power in an atmosphere of supercharged emotions and passions and through the creation of all kinds of unauthorized formations advocating the redrawing of national-state and national-administrative boundaries affirmed in the USSR Constitution, which can lead to unpredictable consequences."

At the meeting of Baku's workers on 13 June, where representatives of labor collectives of industrial enterprises and institutions in the city and of educational

establishments gathered, the general opinion of all participants was expressed clearly on the need for the most rapid return of life in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to normal channels and on the need to manifest self-control and calm everywhere and to be true to proletarian internationalism.

11439

Russian Writer Attacked for Exposing Georgians' 'Dirty Linen'

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 5 March 1988 carries on page 3 under the title "Stand Up With a Sense of Worth, Knowledge of Things, Wisdom. A Writer's Notes" a 2600-word article by Tengiz Buchadze [chairman of the Georgian Culture Fund] on various aspects threatening the character and honor of the Georgian nation.

In the fourth of eight numbered sections, Buchadze complains about an unnamed article that appeared in an unnamed Russian newspaper which, he says, "wittingly or unwittingly insults the Georgian nation." The unnamed author, motivated by a "false sense of nobility and compassion," sensationalized the tragic plight (not further characterized) of a Georgian family still suffering from the after-effects of the repressions of 1937. His "nauseating hand-wringing" constitutes a "meddling in others' dirty linen" and in effect "hits below the belt." It is thus unworthy of the proud traditions of Russian

journalism except for the Katkovs, Velichkos, Pobedonostsevs, Vostorgovs, and their kind. It is up to Georgians to "settle matters in the family," lest "well-wishing journalists" from outside pass such phenomena off as characteristic of all Georgians. Virtually no clues are presented as to the subject matter of the offending article.

In other sections of the article Buchadze quotes from Gorbachev's remarks at the recent CPSU CC Plenum, with particular emphasis on the need to evaluate critically and shun bandwagonism. He deplores the internal bickering, mutual recrimination, backbiting, and vindictiveness that go on among "a minority" of his colleagues and condemns those who are fighting tooth and nail against the rehabilitation of certain eminent figures of the past. He categorically rejects the notion that Georgians did not become "a nation" until the 19th century, defines the writer's tasks—not the least of which is to "defend national interests and instill patriotism" and goes on to deplore the "devaluation" and "inflation" of the intelligentsia, linking these to concerns of "writers who have disgraced themselves." On the subject of the Culture Fund not being given the material support it needs, he says, "we've issued five appeals" with no results, "and we will not issue another, nor will we continue to reproach the apathetic public for failing to come through." To meet the Fund's needs, he proposes that they set up production enterprises and stores, acquiring the right to sell Georgian arts and crafts abroad, using some of the earnings to buy foreign computers and printing equipment, and instituting direct contact with Georgian compatriots living abroad.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

11, Aug. 1988